



3 1761 11895298 5









Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761118952985>









No. 99

N° 99

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 21 March 1994

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Lundi 21 mars 1994



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

*50th anniversary*

**1944–1994**

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.





## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 21 March 1994

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### LAWRENCE MARTIN

**Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora):** I rise today to pay tribute to Lawrence Martin, a constituent, friend and colleague from Sioux Lookout, a town in my riding. Lawrence was recognized last night at the 1994 Juno Awards and received the first Juno for the music of aboriginal Canada.

Mr Martin's significant achievements are many and varied. A great deal of his work is making direct contributions to the aboriginal society. In his principal profession of telecommunications, he has worked with Wawatay Communications and currently acts as Wawatay's executive director. As a recording artist, Lawrence is making an enormous contribution to the visibility of native music and native cultures in Canada and abroad.

His extensive leadership capabilities were recognized by the residents of Sioux Lookout in 1991 with his election to the office of mayor. In his capacity as mayor, I have worked with Lawrence on many occasions and I've been struck by his deep concern for his community and his commitment to those around him. It should also be noted that Lawrence is the first native Canadian to be elected mayor of an Ontario town.

I join with Lawrence's many friends, family and colleagues throughout Ontario in recognizing his remarkable achievements in various diverse endeavours, and I congratulate the Canadian Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences for recognizing his great talent. For those of us who know him, Lawrence Martin has come to symbolize the positive linkages that are needed between the many distinct cultures in our society.

#### LANDFILL

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** Vaughan CARES has released the results of a survey it conducted in January in the Premier's riding. The survey clearly indicates that Mr Rae and the NDP government are totally out of touch with the people of the province of Ontario. A total of 91% of those polled favoured the study of alternatives, including rail haul, incineration, more aggressive 3Rs and central composting. In fact 83% of the residents of York South say that they will not even vote for Premier Rae in the next provincial election.

People want this government to look at alternatives. There are alternatives to building three superdumps in the greater Toronto area. There are alternatives that the people of Peel, York and Durham deserve to have the right to choose.

The residents of York South are making their opinion known to this government, just as the thousands of residents of Durham, Peel and York have been doing

## ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 21 mars 1994

since this flawed process began with the passing of Bill 143 and the Ministry of the Environment setting up the Interim Waste Authority.

The survey tells us the people of Ontario expect more from our government. They expect real alternatives to difficult problems. Mike Harris and the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party have made a commitment to all the residents of Peel, York and Durham that will seek out alternatives. It is time for the NDP and the Liberals to do the same. No more waffling; no more empty promises; real action from a political party that is willing to make promises and keeps them.

#### SCARBOROUGH BLUFFS CONSERVATION

**Mr Robert Frankford (Scarborough East):** My riding of Scarborough East covers the waterfront of Lake Ontario from Markham Road to the Rouge River. The presence of the Scarborough Bluffs as well as the Guild Inn means that this area has much to offer the people of Scarborough and the province in the form of natural and cultural amenities.

I've been participating in discussions about the revitalization of Kingston Road, which bounds this area, along with many local representatives. We see the potential of community economic development and of developing local recreational amenities. The lakeshore features add to these possibilities.

There is, however, one drawback. Areas of the bluffs have been undergoing erosion, and this is now proceeding at an alarming rate. My constituent Gerald Quinn of Sylvan Avenue graphically describes it as resembling the Californian earthquakes when they hear objects rattling on their tables. The local residents have been very patient and have put much time into constructive meetings with conservation authority staff.

Discussions about remediation have been going on for some years now and it has been agreed that construction of a breakwater at the foot of the bluffs is a solution. I want to suggest that construction should be a priority of the Metro conservation authority. Funding is always a difficulty, but this could be an ideal infrastructure project for collaboration with the federal government. We're all looking forward to innovative plans for the waterfront from the regeneration trust, but the rapid rate of erosion requires remediation without further delay.

#### INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** Today is designated as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. This day was proclaimed by the general assembly of the United Nations. As a matter of fact, some cities and some counties have declared the entire week.

I'm not greatly excited about all this. I'm actually



disappointed and almost fed up with the fact that racism issues are being exploited by parties to the right, with their rhetoric and catering to some of the rednecks that goes on with these kinds of remarks, and parties to the left who throw money around and feel that it is Christmastime. The fact is, here it is now like Christmas, so we drop a million dollars here and then we look forward next time again to say, when it comes again, that we will then pay our token contribution to racism.

As you have seen, racism has increased not only in Canada but all around in the world. I am extremely disappointed that today of all the days that we have a day like this, none of the parties here have decided that we would have unanimous consent to speak on this rather serious issue, but what we do is we go around the province and we talk about how concerned we are and committed to eliminating racism.

Commitment is not only money; commitment is a part of feeling the pain of people who are suffering from racism, which should be eliminated by doing something very practical.

#### FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** Every day members of the Legislature are inundated with mail, much of which is completely unnecessary or members never get an opportunity to read it. Nevertheless, it takes an enormous amount of our time to open the mail, sort the mail and throw out those things which we are not interested in. If one is not concerned about the high labour costs of this exercise, one certainly should be about the environmental cost.

I want to extend my personal commendation to the Environmental Assessment Board, which recently sent me a notice indicating that its annual report was available and that I could receive a free copy by returning the attached order form. I was further impressed by the fact that they asked if I wished to receive the report in either French or English, because I am continually astounded by the amount of paper distributed by this government in both French and English to me.

Let's make it perfectly clear that I believe all government documents, such as news releases and annual reports, should be available in both languages so that people do have their choice. That was guaranteed by the passing of the French Language Services Act. But I cannot understand that this government continually distributes every document to every person on its mailing list in both languages.

Environmentalists should be outraged. Taxpayers should be outraged. I believe all government communicators should examine the sensible method employed by the Environmental Assessment Board; that is, offering the document so that you can order it only if you are interested in reading it, and then only taking it in the language of your choice.

1340

#### INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** Today, March 21, is the International Day for the Elimination of

Racial Discrimination. I encourage all members to wear the multicoloured bow, a symbol of the observance of this day, but I would also remind all members that we have a special commitment to show leadership and to work together to fight racism and eliminate all forms of racism and discrimination.

This international day was introduced by the United Nations in the 1960s to remember the Sharpeville massacre in South Africa in which more than 70 peaceful anti-apartheid demonstrators were killed and more than 180 were wounded. The significance of today is also to proclaim and recognize that racial discrimination is a global problem.

On July 29 of last year, I rose in this Legislature to inform the members of the resolution passed by the city of Kitchener condemning acts of racism or discrimination and endorsing the development of policies and actions that will send a clear message that racism will not be tolerated in this or any other community.

In Ontario diversity is our greatest strength, but, sadly, Ontario has not escaped racism. We recognize that racism is one of the serious barriers we face to economic growth and the creation of jobs in this province. Not only is racism unjust, it also results in an enormous waste of human resources.

I would like to take the time to thank the Regional Multicultural Youth Council of Northwestern Ontario for supplying us with bows today. Let us wear the multicoloured bow as a sign of our commitment to fighting racism every day of the year.

#### LEGISLATIVE ACADEMY AWARDS

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** In anticipation of the other Academy Awards tonight, I thought I might just present the Ontario Legislature's own Academy Awards.

In the category of worst original score by an outgoing Premier in an unsupportive role, there's only one nominee; and for his rather screeching performance of *We're All in the Same Sinking Ship Now*, the winner is Bob Rae.

In the category of best question period performance by an actress, the nominees are Marilyn Churley, for *Casino Queen*; Frances Lankin, for *I Could Go On Like This For Ever*; and Marion Boyd, for *In the Name of the Mother*; and the winner is Shelley Martel, for *Silent as a Lamb*.

Finally, the nominees for best actor are Floyd Laughren, for *Honey, I Lost Two Billion*; Tony Silipo, for *Naked Food Bank*; Bob Mackenzie, for *In the Name of the Brothers and Sisters*; Bob Rae, for *That Was Then, This Is Now*; and Gilles Pouliot, for *Smile, You're On Photo-Radar*; and the winner is the entire NDP caucus, for *Unforgiven*.

#### INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** Today marks the anniversary of International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, and it is on this day that we reconfirm our commitment to rid the world of racism.

The United Nations proclaimed this day in 1966 in memory of the 69 South Africans killed protesting



apartheid in the Sharpeville massacre of 1960. Since then we have seen reform in South Africa, with the first ever country-wide election involving all the people of South Africa just a month away. We have seen the release of Nelson Mandela and we have seen a government respond to the needs of the people.

But this day is not just about South Africa. The Sharpeville massacre acted as the catalyst for the recognition of racism. It brought to the forefront the need for public disclosure of racism and racist practices by governments, organizations and individuals in our society.

Today our world is as complicated as it was in 1960. There's a rise in wars against racial groups. We need only to draw our attention to the former Yugoslavia, where an ethnic war has raged, Ireland, where there's a battle between Protestant and Catholic, and in Israel between Jews and Arabs.

Closer to home, we have noted a rise in anti-Semitic activities by neo-Nazis. We've seen attacks on members of our ethnic communities. We've seen widespread outbursts of protest against individuals in our society, whether it be spray-painting swastikas on the Ontario Legislature or the increase of printed hate propaganda against Jewish people, ethnic minorities or aboriginals.

The first step to eliminating racism is understanding. Let us understand we have a need to fight this together.

#### ALGOMA STEEL CORP

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I rise today to speak with some very good news. I want to tell folks about the Algoma Steel Corp. I'd like to tell the members here that for every \$100 invested in the common shares of Algoma on November 10, 1992, yesterday they were worth \$29,500 each. That's 300 times more in the space of 16 months.

What has happened is that the Algoma shares have caused a lot of people to kick themselves in their behinds, none the least your people who stood in this Legislature. I have it in Hansard here. In September 1991 you took the Premier to task. You said he'd lost his compass in the woods. You took the cabinet to task because you said we didn't know what we were doing. I've got it on record here.

#### Interjections.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mr Mills:** Mr Kwinter, your critic for that, said: "My concern is there are decisions being made against Algoma Steel that make no business sense at all." He said: "I just have a problem. You're kidding the troops in saying you're going to go in and you're going to go and turn this thing around, you're going to make it a model of efficiency, you're going to be a world beater, because if it could be a world beater, we would have done it."

That's my concern. I haven't got time. The leader of the third party said the same thing. Shame on all of you. Algoma's a success.

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I would like to take this opportunity to invite all members to welcome to our chamber, and indeed to our country, a very special

group of visitors who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are Mr Velo Edward Sibisi, Mr Vusumzi Pikoli, Mr Innocent Sithole, Mr Valley Omar, Mr Sydney Choma and Ms Elsabi Combrinck. They are visiting from South Africa and are here for the next week and a half to observe our parliamentary practices. Please give them a very warm welcome.

#### LEGISLATIVE PAGES

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I would also invite all members to join me in welcoming the 16th group of pages to serve in the third session of the 35th Parliament: Laura Baxter, Rainy River; Megan Bradley, Lincoln; Meredith Covert, Northumberland; Christopher Enright, Scarborough East; Alice Evensen, Riverdale; Jonah Gindin, Dovercourt; Cindy Grohnwald, St Catharines; Tracy Haynes, Simcoe West; David Holsworth, Kingston and The Islands; Elisa Hung, Oriole; Allison Imrie, Peterborough; Ross Jordan, Ottawa South; Grant Karn, Elgin; Oliver Long, Algoma-Manitoulin; Sean Loughheed, Bruce; Jennifer MacNaughton, Cornwall; Kim McLeese, Frontenac-Addington; Brie Miles, Wentworth East; Ashley-Bree Nason, Kenora; Dennis Patterson, Lambton; Philip Robinson, York-Mackenzie; François Roy, York Mills; Hsien-Yeang Seow, Oakville South; and Matthew Wereley, Lanark-Renfrew. Please welcome our latest group of pages.

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I wish to bring to your attention a matter that seriously infringes my rights and privileges as a member of this Legislature. On or about February 7, the Minister of Municipal Affairs placed a massive advertisement in Ottawa-Carleton newspapers on Bill 77. In this ad he stated, "The bill will be law well in advance of the official closing date for nominations of October 14, 1994." In addition, he said, "I'm calling on the opposition members of the Legislature to cooperate in seeing that this legislation is implemented." Finally, he erroneously stated, "The public has indicated that the time to implement these reforms," meaning Bill 77, "has arrived."

#### 1350

These statements infringe on my rights in three ways. First, the minister has misused public funds for strictly partisan purposes by trying to intimidate the opposition. Second, the minister has made a mockery of our parliamentary system by claiming that Bill 77 will be law by next October. Third, despite massive protests from suburban municipalities, the minister wrongly claims that the public wants his reforms. All of these actions seriously undermine my work as a legislator, and I ask that you request of the minister a public retraction of his purely partisan and highly inappropriate letter to Ottawa-Carleton electors.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** To the member for Nepean, first, I appreciate the fact that he has brought this matter to my attention. He will know that while I don't believe he has a point of privilege, he does touch on something which may in fact be a point of order. I will be delighted to take a look at the material which he has provided and will report back to the member later.



## ORAL QUESTIONS UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question is for the Premier. I am sure we would agree that there is one issue that people across this province are more concerned about than any other issue, and the issue is jobs. Premier, you have talked a lot about the need for optimism. You have said that the recession is over, but we see, sadly, the reality of the latest unemployment figures and we see that there are 10,000 fewer jobs in the province of Ontario in January and February of 1994 than there were in January and February of 1993. If the recession is over, how do you explain 10,000 fewer jobs?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I know it's the job of the Leader of the Opposition to make things sound worse than they really are, but I'm sure if she talked to her colleague the Prime Minister and her colleague the Minister of Finance in Ottawa, they would point out to her the fact that all the indications with respect to this province are that this year is going to be a year of very substantial growth, as was last year.

Let's look at the numbers. We have seen a decline in the number of bankruptcies. We've seen a significant decline in the number of layoffs. We've seen a significant growth in the number of creations of new businesses. We are seeing today, this month, representing the February figures, which were released at the end of last week, an increase of 11,000 new jobs in the province.

I would say to the honourable member that if you look at our strategy with respect to Jobs Ontario and our strategy with respect to encouraging an increase of private investment, we expect that investment this year will increase 8.6% in 1994. We understand that businesses plan to increase their investment this year by 7.2%. We can go with you community by community. In your own community, where I visited just last week, we've got the most substantial investment by Bombardier in partnership with this government—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** We're going to have more people employed at that plant than was ever the case during your administration, than ever before.

Perhaps the honourable member would just accept for a moment that things are getting better. I know it defies the rhetoric of the opposition. Things are improving in Ontario. Things are getting better. We are on the right course and we are on the right track.

**Mrs McLeod:** Premier, you are lost in the clouds of your own rhetoric. I suggest you get down to hard reality, look at the numbers and recognize the people behind the numbers. There are 10,000 fewer jobs in Ontario in 1994 than there were at this time in 1993. Those are real numbers and real people.

Premier, I suggest to you that your predictions, your projections about job recovery, are no better than your government's projections about budget revenues. I would suggest to you that your budget problems have a great deal to do with the fact that there are 10,000 fewer jobs

in this province. Premier, until we can get the people of this province working again, you are going to continue to have revenue shortfalls.

Premier, your government has predicted that we would see 88,000 new jobs in Ontario in 1994. We already have 10,000 fewer jobs. I ask you today, is this one more projection that is already completely offtrack?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say to the honourable member that when she says, for example, that as long as we have such significantly high unemployment we will continue to have a problem with respect to revenues, of course that's true. That's true for our government and that's true for the Liberal government in Ottawa, which I would remind the member is now the federal government, which is continuing its policies of cutting back and discriminating against the province of Ontario, policies which you have been apologizing for and which you have been supporting.

I would say to the honourable member that despite those cutbacks, despite what the federal Liberal government is doing to this province, despite what is taking place, we are determined to keep faith with the people of this province, to maintain the social infrastructure, to maintain the Jobs Ontario programs, to maintain public investment and to make sure that this time next year things will be even better than they are today. We're going to continue on a steady course of job creation, of deficit reduction, a very positive message for the people of Ontario and the people of Canada if only you would let them hear it.

**Mrs McLeod:** All right, Premier, let's talk about keeping faith with the people of this province. Let's talk about those people community by community whom you want to bring your message of hope and optimism to and let's get back to talking about reality.

I suggest to you that this document reflects the reality in some of those communities across the province of Ontario. This is a listing of job losses in one area alone, Trenton-Belleville. There are 16 pages here documenting some 2,600 job losses in over 100 layoffs or closures over the past three years. This is the reality for the communities of Trenton and Belleville, Premier. I think this reality should say to you that your economic plans are not working in spite of all the rhetoric. Your policies are shutting businesses down and they're putting people out of work. You cannot blame this on anybody but you and your own government.

What's happening in the province of Ontario in January and February 1994 is not what's happening across the rest of this country. If you look at the rest of Canada, you will see that there are 143,000 new jobs in January and February 1994. I ask you again, how do you explain that here in Ontario we are still losing jobs?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I'm not going to get into a statistical game with the Leader of the Opposition. I'm going to say to her very directly and as candidly and as clearly as I can that we have been the government during the most difficult recession this province has seen since the 1930s. If you think that a message from you which says that every job loss is the personal fault of the Premier or the Minister of Finance has any credibility with anyone



who's going through this difficult time, you are sadly mistaken.

The Leader of the Opposition has got to come to grips with the fact that there is a very difficult transition. We have stayed the course with the city of Belleville. We have stayed the course with people in Trenton. We have stayed the course with the people in Thunder Bay. When your people were telling us not to help the workers in Kapuskasing, we kept faith with the workers in Kapuskasing. When your people were saying, "Don't do anything for Sault Ste Marie," we kept faith with Sault Ste Marie. You people made a bad deal in terms of the UTDC; we made a good deal in terms of UTDC. We've kept faith with de Havilland. We've kept faith with the people of this province in a difficult time, and we're going to continue to do that despite the gloom and doom we hear from the Leader of the Opposition.

1400

#### ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My second question is also to the Premier, on another subject which I hope he will at least see as being immediate and real and surely in part his responsibility.

Premier, we are 10 days away from a strike deadline at Ontario Hydro. It is clear that public concern is mounting, and I know you're getting the same letters I'm getting. Placer Dome has written to you. They want you to know that any rotating blackouts would pose immediate, major safety concerns for people who work underground at their mine sites. You've had another letter from Petro-Canada. They've written indicating that they are concerned about the immediate economic, environmental and safety impact of a strike at Ontario Hydro.

I ask you today if you will tell the people of this province what you are doing to make sure the lights stay on in the province of Ontario.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Mr Speaker, I'm going to refer that to the minister responsible.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** I recognize the importance of the issue being raised by my friend the Leader of the Opposition and would indicate to her in direct response that my colleague the Minister of Labour has staff meeting with the parties to assist them in the collective bargaining process. We are confident that with goodwill on both sides a voluntary settlement will be negotiated.

**Mrs McLeod:** We all trust that there can be a settlement reached, but as I indicated some two months ago in raising an issue with the Premier, I believe it is the responsibility of the government, of the minister and of the Premier himself to ensure that the health and safety of the people of this province are not jeopardized in the event that there is not a settlement and in the event that there could be a strike at Ontario Hydro.

I asked over two months ago that the Premier indicate what the government's contingency plans would be in the event of a strike, recognizing that the risks of a strike for workers, for patients, for ordinary citizens could be enormous. I ask you today, Minister, what contingency plans are in place in the event that settlement is not

reached and there is a strike at Ontario Hydro?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** We're confident that the parties will work hard to bring about a voluntary settlement that will ensure the health and safety of all people of this province. I want to assure the member that I am aware she is more understanding of the collective bargaining process than her question demonstrates and that she would know it is not in the interests of that process at this time to respond in any other way.

**Mrs McLeod:** I am well aware of the collective bargaining process. I am also aware that there's a situation facing us that we have never before faced in the province, and that is the possibility of an Ontario Hydro strike under the new labour legislation that this government has implemented. It is clear that even Hydro workers themselves are concerned about how they could protect public health and safety in the event of a strike under the new legislation.

Nobody knows how the emergency provisions of Bill 40 are supposed to work. Nobody knows who is going to determine where and when public safety is going to be at risk in the event of a strike. I ask the minister whether any potential agreement with Ontario Hydro workers could act to protect the safety, for example, of the underground workers at Placer Dome. I ask what he will do and what the Premier of this province will do to ensure that there is no risk to public health and safety in the event of a strike at Ontario Hydro.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I'm surprised that the Leader of the Opposition would suggest that it is unusual or in any way surprising that the workers from Ontario Hydro would be concerned about the health and safety of other people in this province. I'm sure that everyone who has had anything to do with the Power Workers' Union and its members understands how seriously they take their responsibilities with regard to all forms of generation in this province, particularly the nuclear generating capacity of this province.

I would say that the best way to protect the health and safety of all workers in this province and the economic benefits that our electricity system produces is to negotiate a voluntary settlement that is acceptable to both sides.

#### LABOUR LEGISLATION

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Premier. There are more than 500,000 people out of work in Ontario today, and there are many more who are afraid they will lose the job they have. Among them are residents of Simcoe county.

Premier, 1,900 jobs may be lost there as a direct result of your labour legislation. CN rail intends to abandon the rail line from Collingwood to Barrie, thus killing nearly 2,000 jobs in the area. Private investors would be willing to continue to run this line and save these jobs, but they can't do it. They can't do it because your Bill 40 treats them as if they were the employer of record all those years. Because of successor rights in Bill 40, they cannot take over this line. Are you willing to save these 2,000 jobs in Simcoe county by amending this provision in Bill 40?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'm going to refer that to

the minister who's most actively on the file, the Minister of Transportation.

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** Bill 40 is not the issue here. There is nothing catalytic; it's not a make-or-break situation. CN is owned by the federal Liberal government. If there is any intent of ripping up the rail, of sapping that vital resource from people's lives, we shouldn't be asked to carry the guilt. It's not a provincial endeavour.

Furthermore, we did not negotiate those collective agreements. The member mentions Bill 40. All Bill 40 did was to close a loophole. The intent and the spirit of collective agreements were negotiated and are the responsibility of the federal government. We will, of course, once we gauge the full impact of public necessity and convenience, make representation not only on behalf of people, on behalf of the commodities, on behalf of the reason for being of municipalities. But I want to make very clear—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** —that Bill 40 does not prevent an agreement being reached by all parties so that an alternative to the existing process can be found.

**Mr Harris:** Clearly, we've got the wrong person on the file. Minister, you say it's not a make-or-break deal. CN says it's Bill 40; the investors say it's Bill 40. How would you like to tell the mayor of Collingwood, who has come here today, that it's not a make-or-break deal? Mayor Raymond Barker has come to Queen's Park and is in the gallery today. He's here to represent these workers. He first wrote to your Premier last year. To date, he has no answer. Maybe nobody's on the file, or at least nobody who understands what's going on.

He wrote again earlier this month to you, Premier. Still no answer. He's in the gallery. He's waiting for an answer. Nearly 2,000 Simcoe county families need an answer.

Since you're now on the file, Minister, having heard what people are saying about Bill 40, are you willing to lead the charge in that cabinet as nobody else is willing to? Are you willing to solve this problem by supporting an amendment to Bill 40, or is your concern for jobs nothing more than political rhetoric?

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** The leader of the third party uses this opportunity as the first question when school's back, when the House resumes today, and indicates that the Minister of Transportation has the wrong file or does not understand the process or diligence in this case. I would like to reciprocate by, with respect, informing the leader of the third party that he was elected to the wrong House: If he's going to cast a stone, he should do it in the big House; he should do it in Ottawa.

I am not aware of an application being put in front of the labour board. I am not aware of a real situation where people have said, "We are willing to seek an alternative to keep people employed: A, B, C, D. What is it you're willing to do?"

All you have to do to be given consideration is to file an application. The proponents know that, the presenters

know that. The ball is clearly in their court. We are the facilitator; we wish to make things happen.

1410

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I want to say first that I'm extremely disappointed that the Premier would not answer this question. For nine months the town of Collingwood has tried to get a response from this government, simply a response from the Premier or the Minister of Labour, not the Minister of Transportation, that this government cares about 2,000 families in the Collingwood, Midland, Orillia and Barrie areas.

Paul Tellier, the president of CN, wrote the Premier on February 25, after months and months and months of trying to get the Premier and the Minister of Labour to address this issue. He wrote the Premier and simply asked the government to turn its attention to this issue, to sit down and negotiate with the Collingwood Rail Retainment Committee and with CN to try to come to a resolution of this matter.

The government doesn't want to admit that there's a problem with its job-killing Bill 40 labour legislation. The fact of the matter is that this does not belong with the Minister of Transportation; this is an issue that belongs to the Premier and the Ministry of Labour. It is succession rights that is the issue—

**The Speaker:** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** —and the government cannot get away with sloughing off the question to a minister who knows not of what he speaks.

My question is—since I'm stuck with this minister—will you support a private member's bill that I'm to introduce in this House this afternoon? I will introduce that private member's bill to amend Bill 40 so we can save those jobs and get on with creating an economic base in this province that's conducive for business to carry on business. Will your government support my private member's bill? That is the question. I want an answer on behalf of the government.

**The Speaker:** The question's been placed.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** It's quite difficult to make a decision on a bill that hasn't been introduced but is in the future some time.

More to the point, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology will be meeting with Paul Tellier, who is the CEO, the chairman, of CN. Last Friday, I met with Doug Young, my federal counterpart, the guy from Tracadie who's responsible for the Ministry of Transport at the federal level. And yes, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of MITT and myself, with the Premier's office, with members of caucus, are right on top of the issue.

What I'm saying, simply put, is that there are many components to this—not to this crisis; the opposition would wish to make it a crisis. We're right on top of it. We are more than interested in 2,000-plus jobs. Premier Rae, Deputy Premier Laughren and the rest of caucus are committed on one issue and one sole issue: to put Ontarians back to work as soon as we can.

**The Speaker:** New question, the leader of the third party.



**Mr Harris:** The people of Ontario are getting fed up with this government blaming the Liberals for everything.

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE REFORM**

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My second question is to the Premier. Gerard Kennedy of the Daily Bread Food Bank said on the weekend that your flip-flopping on welfare reform is causing uncertainty and grave concern to those on welfare, to those most vulnerable in our society. Gerard Kennedy said it is time for you to be upfront about welfare in this province.

There are over a million people in Ontario today who depend on some form of social assistance. Those people, and indeed all taxpayers in Ontario, want to know, what is your government intending to do about welfare reform in this province and when do you intend to do it?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Mr Speaker, I want to say to you, and I would say to Mr Kennedy if he were here, that in the face of a very difficult recession and in the face of the most blatant act of discrimination ever carried out by a federal government, either Liberal or Tory—in fact both—we have kept faith. We have maintained rates and in fact increased rates.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** Which you complained about.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Which you complained about, which the honourable member opposed, which members of his caucus have said was a mistake. We have done that and we're proud of it. I'm proud of the fact that the disabled people in this province have a higher level of support than they do in any other jurisdiction in Canada. I am proud of that.

It's also widely recognized, and I think it's widely recognized as well in Ottawa, that there are things we need to do. In fact, we can only do them together after the total abandonment of this province by the federal government on the subject of welfare.

*Laughter.*

**Hon Mr Rae:** The member for St Catharines laughs. The people living in his riding are getting 29 cents from the federal government. The people living in Shawinigan are getting 50 cents.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** You always blame somebody else.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mr Bradley:** The people from St Catharines blame you.

**Hon Mr Rae:** No, no, no, no.

**Mr Bradley:** They want you out.

**The Speaker:** Would the member for St Catharines take his seat.

**Mr Bradley:** That's the difference; they want you out.

**The Speaker:** I caution the member for St Catharines to please come to order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say to the honourable member that we are working with the federal government and we are working with all of our partners in the municipalities and elsewhere to ensure the continuing integrity of our support for people who have no other means of support

in the community and who qualify for social assistance. We're going to continue to do that, and I'm hoping that we will be in a position through this next week and in the very next couple of days to make a very clear announcement with respect to exactly what it is we can and cannot do on this question. But I want to tell the honourable member, we are very proud of the fact that in the face of very, very difficult financial circumstances, we have kept faith and we have maintained rates, and we are determined to maintain the integrity of that system. We're going to do that.

**Mr Harris:** I want to make it very clear to the Premier that nobody is prouder than I that this province has had the wealth and the prosperity and the ability for those who truly need help to have the most generous assistance in Canada. I am proud of that. I am proud to have been a part of it.

But, Premier, according to David Frum of the Financial Post, aside from those who legitimately need help, there are three times as many households on welfare at the end of 1993 as there were in the depths of the recession of 1981. In fact, when the money was pouring in between 1985 and 1990, the number of people on welfare in this province went up and up and up under the Liberals. There is no end, unless there is substantial welfare reform, to the number of people who will be willing to accept welfare as a lifestyle. You know that's wrong. I know that's wrong. We've had general agreement now from study after study, from SARC to Thomson to others that the Liberals sat on and now you have sat on for the last three years. I would ask you, clearly, since you know and the people of Ontario know there's something wrong with this system, when are you going to bring forward proposals that we've all been calling for to fix the system?

**Hon Mr Rae:** The one thing I can tell the honourable member is that this government, when it fixes a system, is not going to blame the victim. That's what this government is not going to do. We are not going to join in this right-wing chorus, which the leader of the third party now wants to be the guardian angel of, which says that the real problem with respect to social assistance is the people who are on it and that they're lazy. I want to tell the honourable member, that is not the view of this government and that is not the view of this party. The reason that we have high levels of social assistance is because we have very high levels of unemployment.

I would say to the honourable member, the reforms to unemployment insurance which his federal counterparts brought in have increased the burden of social assistance by some \$200 million over the next three years. The reforms which were brought in by the Chrétien government will increase it by a further \$150 million. That's the impact of the kind of reform that we've seen from Liberals and Tories.

I can assure the honourable member, we brought in Jobs Ontario Training. We've taken thousands of people off welfare and put them into the workforce. We've created child care spaces. We have the best social housing program going in Canada. We're going to continue to put the emphasis on work—

**The Speaker:** Could the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —and on training and on fairness, and never talk about what it is that's wrong with the victim rather than what's wrong with the system. There's a system that needs reform, and people need dignity. They don't need to be blamed, which tends to be the approach of some other parties.

1420

**Mr Harris:** I think the record will show that nobody has been more consistent, including Helle Hulgaard, in saying: "Let's not blame the victim. Let's not blame those on welfare. Let's blame the system. Let's blame the government."

Let's put the blame where it belongs, right here in this Legislature. The system is broken. The system needs fixing. The Liberals sat on this for five years; in fact, they made the problem worse. You have sat on it now for three and a half years. Every year we have a throne speech; we have a session opener. Welfare reform is a top priority, you say. Every year we ask questions: When are you going to reform the system?

Premier, I ask you again: Is your government finally willing to stop the rhetoric? Are you willing to stop saying it's just a priority? Are you willing to move on welfare reform in this province so we can do two things: one, help those people who truly need help in a most generous and compassionate way, as this province is known for, and stop the ripoffs and abuse of the system by those who have no business being on it? Are you willing to bring forward those proposals this session?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say I think the record will speak for itself in terms of what we have done and also what the honourable member opposite has said on the subject of welfare: how he thinks it's okay for someone to say, "No, I'm just going to go on it. That's the way I want to be"; the very speeches that he's made, the kind of encouragement that he has given.

I want to say to the honourable member, our record is clear. We're the ones who brought in Jobs Ontario Training, which the Conservative Party has opposed. We're the ones who have expanded child care by over \$200 million in the last three years, and we will continue to do that. That's how you do it: through training opportunities, through child care opportunities, through a serious effort to offer incentives. That's what this government is doing and that's what we will continue to do. That is the reform that we are carrying on.

#### LABOUR LEGISLATION

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** Surely both the Premier and the leader of the third party understand you can't have social welfare reform unless there are jobs for people to go to, which is why I want to return to the question of the job loss that could be incurred if the Barrie short-line rail problem is not resolved. I will place my question to the Premier.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Chatham-Kent.

**Mrs McLeod:** I will place this question to the

Premier, because it was to the Premier that I wrote about this issue some six weeks ago and I am still awaiting his response.

Premier, it is quite clear that the short rail line between Collingwood and Barrie is the cheapest or the only transportation link for a number of local businesses and that there are indeed a great number of jobs that depend on the existence of those businesses. It is also clear that CN no longer intends to run the line and that there are other potential purchasers of the route who have said they can run it. But it is clear as well that the cost of the successor rights provisions under Bill 40 make it impossible for anybody else to take it over.

Premier, let me give you the example, and that's that implementing the successor rights under Bill 40 could mean that any new purchaser of that rail line would have to pick up some 17 collective agreements even though they would need to employ 10 or fewer workers to run the line. I ask you, does that not seem to you to be absolutely ridiculous, and if so, will you not grant an exemption from the successor rights provisions under Bill 40 for any new purchaser of the Barrie short-line rail?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Let me say to the honourable member, the lead ministry in this is the Ministry of Transportation. Economic Development and Trade and Labour are involved. We have a group of people who are tackling this question. We take it seriously. We also believe the federal government continues to have some responsibility with respect to the CN line. I'm not passing responsibility; we want to be constructive and helpful.

Experience will tell us that a solution has to involve the workers, and we are initiating discussions with the unions. It has to involve the purchasers. It has to involve CN in terms of its responsibilities. And the federal government has to be there; they can't just walk away.

There will be a negotiated solution to this question, I'm quite confident. It should happen. But it's one that's going to have to involve some give and take on all sides. That's how these things are resolved: not one simple solution here or there, but a sense of give and take that will be there. There are all kinds of opportunities for this to happen, and I want to give the honourable member my assurance and give the assurance to the people who are listening that the government is very interested in this question and in being a constructive partner together with others in finding a solution, because that's what it's going to take: give and take on everyone's part in order to find a solution.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I guess the question is, who is giving and who is taking? So far, all we see is this government taking and not giving anything on this particular issue.

The Premier might be interested to know that this morning in fact I heard from a potential purchaser group involving some of the current employees, in fact the model that this Premier has touted as the way to go in Ontario. These are the actual workers, who are members of the union, who are interested in taking over this line. They too, Mr Premier, want you to amend your job-killing labour legislation to help them acquire this particular property. They are unable to assume the responsibility



ity that lies under 17 collective agreements. In that regard, they have asked that we also sponsor a private member's bill. In the past, you have been noted to support private member's bills that this member has put forward; maybe I can get you to do the same, if I could get a page to come and take this over.

I've also agreed to sponsor a private bill incorporating a new railway company for these workers to take over this spur line if indeed they are the successful bidder, but they insist, sir, that you must agree to amend Bill 40 before they are prepared to make the financial commitment. The legislation I've introduced to you, Premier, will pave the way to allow communities such as Collingwood and Barrie to work with interested buyers, be it the workers or be it someone else, to keep the rail line open and to protect the jobs in that community. Premier, will you make a statement today that you are prepared to support these jobs and to support this legislation, and will you use your authority to ensure that this private member's bill passes quickly through this Legislature?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would simply say to the honourable member that we want to be constructive in this regard, and we are looking to finding a solution on a practical basis to a series of problems. It's clear this isn't just a one-off issue. We're going to have this on a systematic basis because of the decision by CN to abandon a number of lines and the potential that those lines could be used for other purposes and could be used in other ways by appropriate purchasers.

I would say to the honourable member, if he looks at the experience rather than the rhetoric, with respect to the ACR there was no government more determined to find a solution, which was difficult, which required concessions on all sides and which required a willingness to move. We were the ones who helped to engineer and to focus that question. I can assure the honourable member that I'd be very interested in getting the names of the people that he's referring to, very interested in hearing what their concerns are and how we can in fact meet and deal with this problem. We are very interested in finding solutions, and we do not want to see any legislative roadblocks to finding a successful solution.

#### ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** My question is to the Premier. It's about Ontario Hydro. Considering the escalating concerns that are taking place with respect to Ontario Hydro and its unions, considering the fact that there have been discussions about strikes and work stoppages and also considering the provisions of your Bill 40 and the impact of operating the sites if there is in fact work stoppage, could you answer the question that is being most widely asked out there in the business community and the public itself considering the jeopardy of the health and safety of the communities in Ontario? If the Hydro people go on strike, Mr Premier, would you be prepared to legislate them back to work for the safety of the people of the province of Ontario?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'll refer that again to the Minister of Environment and Energy.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** I think I answered that question in response to

a query from the leader of the official opposition in terms of her understanding of the collective bargaining process and mine. I'm not sure that the member opposite has the same understanding of collective bargaining, but I suspect he does, and he must know that this question does not make it possible or enhance the opportunities for a negotiated settlement.

1430

**Mr Stockwell:** There are a significant number of businesses in this province that operate with the need for hydro. Clearly, it's one of the most important things that we supply as this province. Certainly, with your Bill 40, it becomes rather difficult to ensure safety and health for all the citizens of Ontario to be properly managed if in fact there were a strike.

The question that's coming from the public is, if there is a strike, is this government prepared to legislate those workers back to work to ensure economic stability and care for the health and safety of the people of this province? I understand the collective process, but I think it's important for you to think on behalf of the citizens of this province. We must know if you're prepared to legislate these people back to work. All the businesses and people would like to know this.

If you're not prepared, say so, and that is not going to affect the length or the type of negotiations you're going to have. If you're not prepared to do that, tell the workers today. If you are prepared to do that, may I suggest your strike could be a lot quicker and your negotiations could be settled in a much more timely fashion.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I'm tempted to say that the way the member has posed the question indeed indicates that he doesn't understand the collective bargaining process. The fact is that the government, the members of the Power Workers' Union, the members of the Ontario Hydro board and management are all concerned about the health and safety of the people of this province and recognize the importance of electricity and the generation of electricity to the economy of this province.

All will do their utmost to ensure that there is no disruption in service. I'm sure the best way to do that is to negotiate an agreement that is acceptable to both sides.

#### PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** My question is for the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Recently Metro council voted to build only two of the four rapid transit lines. In a last-minute flip-flop, Liberal Metro Chairman Alan Tonks decided to kill the over 30,000 additional direct jobs that would have been created by constructing the Spadina-York University subway extension and the Scarborough RT. The existing transportation needs of the people of Downsview, Weston and Vaughan have lost out to the land speculators and the more affluent communities along Sheppard Avenue East, from Yonge Street to Don Mills.

My question to you, Minister, is, will you allow Liberal Chairman Tonks and Metro council to stop the creation of over 30,000 direct jobs and ignore the transportation needs of the Downsview, Weston, Vaughan and Scarborough communities?



**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** While we were disappointed that in the council resolution all four projects didn't get the unqualified support to proceed at this point in time, I want to point out that there was approval in principle for all projects. Two projects are moving ahead right away, which is good; that's 38,000 jobs. But I agree with the member that the other 30,000 jobs are more than a worthwhile goal. We remain committed to doing everything we can to see all four projects proceed.

Specifically, you make reference to transportation needs of parts of the city. By that, I know you're referencing the fact that the Spadina line was not one of the two that have been given approval. We are working with people along that Spadina line to see the potential. We think we can in fact maximize the potential we think is there, to involve private sector development in the cost of proceeding with that line. Additionally, there have been proposals to move ahead with a design-build approach on the Scarborough light rapid transit as well.

We think there are ways, through involving the private sector and through issuing a debenture on these lines, that all four could proceed at this point in time without additional tax burden to the residents of Metro.

**Mr Perruzza:** I respect the sincerity and the hard work that the minister is doing in order to ensure that the four projects and that all of the lines and all of the jobs move. But I have to tell you that I was at Metro council when Metro was deliberating this very question, and there was a lot of wheeling and dealing and private deal-making.

While the public rhetoric was that money was the issue, and taxes and so on, I have to tell you that in the end Metro opted for the most expensive of all of the options. I believe the Sheppard subway is going to cost \$400 million more than the Spadina-York University line, at a direct cost to Metro of \$100 million.

While I respect the efforts of the minister, the ministry and the government to get the jobs and the projects off the ground, I have to tell you that Metro's games-playing and its commitment to our job creation programs are very much questionable. How long will we allow Metro to continue with the games if the deal can't be made?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I think the member raises a very interesting point with respect to the reasons given for not proceeding with Spadina and Scarborough in reference to costs and the relative cost-value assessments of the various lines.

Having said that, we are working right now with Metro to pursue alternatives in terms of financing. They've established a committee. That committee is to report back by June. I hope that we can find a solution before that time, but there is a time reference that was built into the council resolution.

I think the member raises points that will be of interest to the Ministry of Transportation whenever a final package is brought forward. If we're not successful in achieving all four lines whenever that package is brought forward, then the Ministry of Transportation will be reviewing that and looking at those projects and looking

at the cost-value assessments. I think those are points that he raises that are of value and the ones we should continue to look at as this unfolds.

#### ONTARIO HYDRO SPENDING

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I have a question to the Minister of Environment and Energy concerning some of the incidents that the workers at Ontario Hydro have had to put up with over the last several months. But in particular, I have two interesting items which have gained a lot of attention in my area, where we have lost now over 900 jobs with respect to the early retirements, the layoffs. Maurice Strong has a vision and my community lives the nightmare that has to deal practically with the problems created by Mr Strong.

I want the Minister of Environment and Energy to tell me if he agrees with two actions taken by Ontario Hydro: first, advertising for a parking lot official for an advertised salary of upwards of \$81,900 per annum to manage a parking lot; and second, if he approves of the over-\$1-million ad campaign talking about the new Ontario Hydro, which we see posted all over the bus shelters of this city. Does he believe that those two steps have added to the credibility of the management decisions and to the efficient operation and production of affordable power in this province?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** In reference to the member's preamble, I would say that perhaps the former Conservative and then Liberal governments had a vision with regard to Darlington, and now perhaps Bruce is living the nightmare of Darlington. I would say that the decisions related to the overbuilding of the capacity for Ontario Hydro have had to be responded to. That has led to a significant downsizing of Ontario Hydro in attempting to deal with its excess capacity.

With regard specifically to the two instances that the member raises with regard to the day-to-day operations of Ontario Hydro, I assume from his question that he wants to ensure that Ontario Hydro does not spend money unwisely, and if he is suggesting that these are ways that the corporation should review its spending, I will bring that to the attention of the senior management of Ontario Hydro. I'm pleased that the member supports the attempts to ensure that any excess expenditure by Ontario Hydro is ended.

**Mr Elston:** That was a total abrogation of the minister's responsibility for Hydro in this chamber. He refused to answer any of the question with respect to advertising or with respect to the posting of this high-priced position for managing a staff of three people.

Perhaps the Minister of Environment and Energy, since he's raised the issue of capacity and other things at Ontario Hydro, would like to tell me, when his ordered review is taken on by the Ontario Energy Board, if he would be willing to do two things: one, to commit that the decision of the board that reviews the Ontario Hydro vision as it will be put, I presume, by Mr Strong and others, will be a decision which will be binding upon Hydro which he will enforce; two, to undertake with us, particularly those of us who represent areas in which workers are being laid off in large numbers, like Lennox,



Lambton and Bruce, to table in this House the vision of what Hydro is to be in the next five months, five years and 10 years so that we all know what the vision at Ontario Hydro really is.

1440

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The member would know that what he is requesting with regard to the Ontario Energy Board process would require legislative change in order to ensure that the decision of the board is more than providing reference and advice. I note that his government did not make that kind of legislative change when it had the opportunity.

I would also say to him that I am very concerned about the communities that he has mentioned and will be meeting later today with representatives of the communities affected. I'll be pleased to hear their views. Of course, he knows that before the Ontario Energy Board, any interested party, whether it be a member of the community, a municipal leader, business leader, labour leader or members of other interested groups such as environmental groups, will be able to make their views very clear on what the future of Ontario Hydro should be and how it relates to the operation of management and the setting of rates.

#### WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** Although my question is for the Minister of Labour, since he's not here I will go to the Treasurer since it is a financial question.

In an effort to address its financial problems, the Workers' Compensation Board has been considering expanding its scope of coverage to include the financial services sector. Unfortunately, the WCB still believes that the answer to its financial problems is to seek more and more revenue from Ontario's beleaguered employers, as opposed to controlling its own expenditures.

Given the recent commitment by your government to establish a royal commission to review the workers' compensation system, it would obviously make a mockery of this process to proceed with expansion. Will you give us your assurance that the WCB will not proceed with expansion of its coverage to the financial services sector until the royal commission completes its report?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** Perhaps I could put a little perspective on this matter briefly to the member. The royal commission issue was what was recommended to the government from the Premier's Labour-Management Advisory Committee. It is not a decision that the government at this point has taken, just so that is clear. I'm not ruling it out; I'm just saying that it's not at this point a decision of the government.

I'm very much aware of the whole issue of expanded coverage. The argument being made for it is that those financial institutions benefit a great deal from the work that goes on, for example, by the mining industry, by the construction industry, by the forestry industry, yet they don't pay an assessment to the Workers' Compensation Board. On the other side of the coin, I do understand their argument that most of them already have coverage through the private sector and therefore don't need to be

covered by the Workers' Compensation Board. It's an interesting issue on which the government has not made any decision at this point.

**Mrs Witmer:** Minister, I'm glad that you made that point clear, because there is some feeling among the members of the business community that the royal commission is going to be issuing a report and that you will not be making any further changes. You have certainly indicated to us that you are probably going to be making some changes unilaterally, either through regulation or legislation, and in some ways the royal commission is nothing more than a ploy to deflect the heat from the problems at the WCB. I think it's important that we recognize that. It's not going to be a delay.

Another area of concern is the fact that there is a plan to expand entitlement to include compensation for chronic stress. We have asked for a moratorium on all new entitlements such as chronic stress. Again I ask you: Will you give your assurance that indeed there will be a moratorium until the royal commission completes its task and makes a report?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I need to stress yet again to the honourable member that there has been no royal commission appointed. The member is talking as though it already exists and is about to report, or is going to report in the foreseeable future. That simply is not a decision that's been made.

The member also talks about us making unilateral decisions on either expanded coverage or enhanced benefits to injured workers. I would simply say to the member that for many, many, many years the problem of the unfunded liability has been growing and that if we did make a unilateral decision, we would be the first government that actually tackled the problems at the Workers' Compensation Board. Certainly, the previous government sat back on its hands and watched the problem develop and grow and grow and grow. I don't think it is fair for the member opposite to imply that because we would make some decisions we would be avoiding the problems at the Workers' Compensation Board. As a matter of fact, we, for the first time, would be dealing with the very serious problems there.

#### TENDERING PROCESS

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Madam Speaker—Madam Minister; we've been away for a while; you'll have to pardon me—there's a situation that has arisen in northeastern Ontario in regard to tree seedling growers, an issue that a number of us have dealt with over the past couple of years. Specifically, what has happened is this: The MNR has let out contracts in regard to who is going to be growing seedlings for the province of Ontario. What has happened is that a number of Quebec firms have bid on the tree seedling contracts in the province of Ontario through that particular bid system, and one particular firm that I know of received a contract to grow a number of tree seedlings for the province.

The difficulty is this: In my looking around the issue and meeting with people like Energreen greenhouses in Ramore and other greenhouse growers in northeastern



Ontario, I found that not only have Quebec growers bid on Ontario contracts; what's really the problem here is that the Ontario growers don't have the ability to bid back into the province of Quebec because the province of Quebec has a preferential treatment regulation—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Bisson:** Mr Speaker, this is a very serious issue. It'll take a second to get through.

The question is simply this: Presently the province of Quebec, when it comes to growers, has the ability to be able to bid into Ontario. Unfortunately, the Ontario growers do not have the same ability. I would simply like to ask the minister this: What is your ministry doing in order to be able to address this issue?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I'm most certainly aware of the problem. I think it's important to set the context and remind ourselves that for some time in Ontario seedling operations were actually done on a regional basis and there were protective measures that were in place in Ontario as well. For a number of years, MNR has been working towards moving to a more open tendering system. The Provincial Auditor has supported moving in that direction and, quite frankly, our government supports that as we try to bring down interprovincial trade barriers.

We have done that now in Ontario, and Ontario contractors are actually winning contracts in Alberta and in BC. However, you're also right that we don't have that equal access into the Quebec market. This is an issue that is under negotiation, both in the bilateral negotiations—

*Interjection.*

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I haven't taken my whole time yet—and in the multilateral negotiations, and we're hopeful of making some progress there. What would be helpful, though, are the specific cases that you raise where people have tried, so that we can document it. It's helpful to take that information to the negotiating table.

**Mr Bisson:** Can I ask the minister, in regard to the negotiations that are going on now, is the province of Ontario ready to sit down with the province of Quebec and say, "Listen, all we ask is that Ontario growers be treated the same way as Quebec growers"? If Quebec growers have the ability to bid into the province of Ontario, clearly Ontario growers should have the same right to do so into the province of Quebec. If the Quebec government is not willing to move on that issue, what will this minister do in regard to putting pressure on the province of Quebec to open up the process to Ontario growers?

Just for a bit of background, what happens in areas such as Ramore is that its only employer happens to be a greenhouse. The difficult is that by not having access to those particular contracts because of what happened with this particular grower, it puts—

**The Speaker:** Would the member place his question, please.

**Mr Bisson:** —them in a very serious business to be able to operate that company over the longer run.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I missed the very tail end of that

question, but the gist of it, I understand, is with respect to what action we are taking in the negotiations between Quebec and Ontario.

I can indicate that the procurement policy with respect to goods and services, and this would be considered a service, is under negotiation, both in the multilateral negotiations involving all provinces, but also in the bilateral negotiation with Quebec. We expect that we will reach conclusion of those negotiations by late April, so we are expecting that this issue will be resolved under that context and we are hopeful at this point in time that it will be resolved in that context. I think that to prejudge what will happen, or to suggest that if we don't win on this what will we do, would suggest failure on the entire set of negotiations and I'm not ready to concede that at this point.

1450

#### CASINOS

**Mr Carman McClelland (Brampton North):** To the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Minister, what were the initial estimates for the renovations for the interim casino project in Windsor and what are the actual costs coming in at?

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** I don't have that information today and really the Minister of Economic Development and Trade is responsible for that, so I will hand the question to her.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** Mr Speaker, I am sorry. Having just finished the other question, I didn't hear the member's question.

**The Speaker:** Would the member place his question.

**Mr McClelland:** Actually, I had two questions, Mr Speaker, a supplementary I am now not going to get on as a result. The question that I asked initially was the initial estimate of the costs of the renovations for the interim casino site in Windsor and now the actual costs as they are coming in.

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I will provide those exact numbers to the member. I don't have them with me at this moment. There have been some additional costs incurred, as structural issues and other issues with respect to design of the building, the renovations, have been incurred during the construction and renovation. There are some changes from the original projections to the costs now and I will provide the members with the details of that.

**Mr McClelland:** I have a bit of difficulty in terms of a supplementary, unless the Minister of Economic Development and Trade can refer it back; I'm not sure. I really wanted to know what the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations' plans are today with respect to the extension of commercial gaming in the province of Ontario, on first nations reserves and other locales in the province of Ontario.

A few months ago, indeed a few weeks ago, the position of the government was that there would be one site, Windsor, for three years, to take a look at it. The



minister was very unequivocal in her position. That was her position. Apparently that's changed today and it might be different tomorrow.

**The Speaker:** Could the member place his question, please.

**Mr McClelland:** I'm wondering, what is your position today with respect to the establishment and the extension of commercial gaming in the province of Ontario, both on and off first nations reserves?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** The member attempted to switch back and at this point in time he has asked a question which is not within the purview of my portfolio. I can indicate to him that with respect to the interim casino, and I come back to his original question, there will be rent provided to the art gallery of \$6 million over the three years and there will be a \$1.3-million provision to it to reconvert back to the art gallery at the end. His first question was specifically with respect to the costs of renovations, and I will have to get back to him on the details of that.

#### PETITIONS PHOTO-RADAR

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** The petition reads as follows:

"Whereas the NDP government of Ontario is planning to implement a photo-radar system to penalize speeding drivers; and

"Whereas the provincial freedom of information commissioner has ruled that the NDP's photo-radar system violates the province's protection of privacy legislation; and

"Whereas there may be a number of legal and constitutional challenges to the NDP's photo-radar legislation; and

"Whereas the photo-radar system will cost millions of dollars to set up and implement; and

"Whereas the photo-radar fines involve no demerit point penalties, which the Minister of Transportation has said are the only way to force the public to obey other highway safety regulations, such as the use of seatbelts; and

"Whereas the photo-radar legislation penalizes the owner of the vehicle even if the owner is not responsible for the violation; and

"Whereas there have been concerns raised as to whether photo-radar technology will accurately measure the speed of all vehicles; and

"Whereas the government newsletter quotes a ministry staff person admitting that photo-radar is only being implemented to bring new revenue to the province; and

"Whereas the NDP government is already wasting too much of the revenue it does receive;

"We, the undersigned, demand that the NDP government cancel its plans to implement photo-radar and cancel its photo-radar legislation."

I sign this as I'm in agreement with this petition.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I have a

petition here with approximately 250 names from people in Stouffville and Markham:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas traditional family values that recognize marriage as a union between a man and a woman are under attack by Liberal MPP Tim Murphy in his private member's Bill 45; and

"Whereas this bill would recognize same-sex couples and extend to them all the same rights as heterosexual couples; and

"Whereas the bill was carried with the support of an NDP and a Liberal majority, but with no PC support, in the second reading debate on June 24, 1993; and

"Whereas this bill is currently with the legislative committee on administration of justice and is being readied for quick passage in the Legislature; and

"Whereas this bill has not been fully examined for financial and societal implications;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to stop this bill and future bills which would grant same-sex couples the right to marry, and to consider its impact on families in Ontario."

I have affixed my name to this petition.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and it's signed by almost 700 of my constituents who live in Wilmot Creek:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to proceed as expeditiously as possible to third reading and royal assent of Bill 21."

I have affixed my signature to this petition.

#### BROADCAST OF QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario which I wholeheartedly support:

"Whereas thousands of Ontario residents are deeply concerned about issues such as taxes, auto insurance, wasteful spending and the provincial economy; and

"Whereas the broadcast of the proceedings of the Legislature is crucial to helping the public understand what its elected officials are doing; and

"Whereas TVOntario does not broadcast the daily question period until late at night;

"We, the undersigned, request that the government encourage TVOntario to schedule its broadcast of question period earlier in the evening so that all Ontarians can become more involved in the proceedings of the Legislature and the actions of their elected officials."

I have signed this petition.



## LANDFILL

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the recent announcement by the NDP government to choose three superdumps within the greater Toronto area has disturbed and upset local residents; and

"Whereas these superdumps might have been prevented if Bill 143 had allowed the Interim Waste Authority to look at all alternatives during the site-selection process; and

"Whereas we would like to ensure that the province of Ontario is making the best decision based on all the facts regarding incineration and long rail-haul and garbage management;

"We demand the NDP government of Ontario to repeal Bill 143, disband the IWA and place a moratorium on the process of finding a landfill to serve all of the greater Toronto area until all alternatives can be properly studied and debated."

I have affixed my signature to this petition.

## LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

It's been signed by dozens and dozens and dozens of people from my riding in the community of Sutton-by-the-Lake. They're astonished by the delays the opposition played in this committee process and were very angry it took them this long. I hope we can proceed with it.

1500

## SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** I have a petition to the Honourable Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario regarding Bill 55, introduced by Progressive Conservative member Don Cousens.

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 55 makes it illegal, with fines of up to \$50,000, for people to make any public statement, written or oral, which ridicules, demeans or discriminates against a person on the grounds of sexual orientation, still undefined. This is a grave threat to free speech in a democratic society.

"Bill 55 is also an attack on freedom of religion, against historical Christianity, which does not condone homosexuality.

"We want to maintain our basic right to disagree with homosexuality, which in no way should be equated with hatred.

"We have moved away from a position where some homosexuals and other special-interest groups are no longer content to express their ideas, but are demanding that contrary views be suppressed with stiff penalties.

"At the same time, these special-interest groups will be allowed to teach their controversial alternative lifestyles to youngsters in the classrooms, thereby proselytizing children with their viewpoints without allowing for differing opinions."

It's signed by 85 constituents.

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** Mr Speaker, on a point of order, or it may be a point of personal privilege: The honourable member for Brant-Haldimand just referred in his petition to a certain private member's Bill 55. I would like to inform him, if he doesn't already know so, that he could save his breath on such petitions: That bill has been withdrawn. I did withdraw it. I brought it into the House in good faith to do something to—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Cousens:** No, on this point of order, because he's made this petition. I'd say it is not valid. He may as well save his breath.

## SENIOR CITIZENS' HOUSING

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and signed by some 120 constituents of the city of London and the county of Middlesex.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We, the undersigned, would like to let it be known that we oppose Bill 120 and want it defeated at the third reading.

"The NDP government has not given any thought to the impact of this bill to retirement homes, despite the effort to give input by these facilities. By placing retirement homes under the Rent Control Act, Landlord and Tenant Act and Rental Housing Protection Act, you will cause serious problems to the running of these homes.

"Our elderly need these homes to help them to continue to be independent individuals who need assistance with their daily lives but not to the extent of nursing homes. By placing retirement homes under the landlord act, the care givers would not have ongoing access to the residents' rooms and emergency situations would go unnoticed.

"The residents are in these homes so they can be watched, helped and protected if needed. Residential care should fall under the umbrella of the Ministry of Health, not the Ministry of Housing.

"Before you place another Band-Aid solution on a problem, stop this bill."

This petition has been signed by many people, 120 families in London and Middlesex, and I'm adding my name to the petition.

## SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION

**Mr Robert Frankford (Scarborough East):** I have



a petition signed by many parents of children at St Boniface school in Scarborough concerned about the overcrowded conditions that exist there. They're petitioning the government to address this growing problem and finance the addition to the school as a high priority.

The petition states that their concern is about the over 600 students who attend there, most accommodated in 15 portables onsite. The portables take up most of the school yard, covering two baseball fields and one soccer field. The gym is inadequate, the washrooms are limited, the office space is very crowded, with little space available.

I'm pleased to add my support to this petition.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I too have a petition that was given to me much in advance of the withdrawal of Bill 55, but I feel obligated to read it into the record for Mr Eldon Grist. The member for Markham, who tabled that bill, has made some indication that it's been withdrawn, but in any event I read the petition:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 55"—which the member for Markham introduced and made reference about earlier—"will make it illegal, with fines of up to \$50,000, for people to make any public statement, written or oral, which ridicules, demeans or discriminates against a person on the grounds of sexual orientation. This is a grave threat to free speech in a democratic society."

I won't read any more of the preamble but just indicate that I will attach my signature, as is required by the rules of the House.

#### PROCEEDS OF CRIME

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that reads:

"Whereas criminals can currently derive profit from the sale of recollections of their crime; and

"Whereas criminals can also derive profit for interviews and public appearances; and

"Whereas this can cause suffering of crime victims and that of their families;

"We, the undersigned, demand that private member's Bill 85, Proceeds of Crime Act, be passed into law."

I've signed that as well.

#### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** I have a petition signed by parents, teachers and students of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, St Joachim, St Patrick's, St Columba, St Bernadette, St Ann's and many others which reads:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act now and restructure the way in which municipal and provincial tax dollars are apportioned so that Ontario schools are funded not only fully but with equity and equality."

#### HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a

petition from a number of residents who are concerned about creeping user fees, that reads as follows:

"Whereas the NDP has always said it was against user fees in health care and other social services; and

"Whereas the NDP promised it would never implement user fees for health care and other services of a social nature; and

"Whereas the NDP has bowed to pressure from the Conservative Party and is now working to implement user fees in a number of areas; and

"Whereas the NDP government is now planning to implement a number of health user fees by charging for various necessary drug treatments, for annual checkups, psychiatric counselling and speech therapy for children and other necessary services; and

"Whereas the NDP government is trying to fool the public by saying that these are not user fees but rather copayments; and

"Whereas it has been shown that user fees do not make health services more accountable but only restrict access;

"We, the undersigned, urge the NDP government to reconsider its new policy on user fees and protect the integrity of our universal health care system by cancelling its proposed user fees on health services."

I'm going to add my name because I agree with the petitioners who have asked me to present this to the House.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** My petition is from Mr John A. McIntosh in Waterloo.

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and therefore could include sado-masochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all references to sexual orientation should be removed from the Ontario Human Rights Code and Bill 45.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

#### MOTIONS

##### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that notwithstanding standing orders



8(a) and 96(a), the House will not meet on the morning of Thursday, March 24, 1994, to consider private members' public business; that notwithstanding standing order 96(h), the requirement for notice be waived with respect to ballot items 43, 44, 45 and 46; and that Mr Poirier and Mr Elston exchange places in the order of precedence for private members' public business.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall the motion carry? Carried.

1510

#### COMMITTEE SITTING

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I have one other motion, and I seek the consent of the House. The standing committee on the Legislative Assembly committee is currently conducting interviews for the Environmental Commissioner under the Environmental Bill of Rights, and we agreed at the House leaders' meeting this morning that that committee should be allowed to sit beyond 6 o'clock; that where it has scheduled an interview that either commenced before 6 o'clock or was supposed to commence before 6 o'clock, it should complete that interview even if it means sitting past 6 of the clock.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall the motion carry? Carried.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr Marchese from the standing committee on administration of justice presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill 62, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act in respect of the Niagara Escarpment / *Projet de loi 62, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection de l'environnement à l'égard de l'escarpement du Niagara.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

Shall the bill be reported for third reading?

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** No. Committee of the whole.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Committee of the whole.

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Mr Paul Johnson from the standing committee on finance and economic affairs presented the committee's report on the underground economy and moved the adoption of its recommendations.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Does the member wish to make a brief statement?

**Mr Paul R. Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings):** I would like to say that this is the first time the standing committee on finance and economic affairs has examined the underground economy in the province of Ontario. I want to thank the clerk, Lynn Mellor, and certainly the research officer, Elaine Campbell, for the very hard work they did with regard to this report. I also want to thank the many witnesses for their very valuable

presentations before the committee. I move adjournment of the debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Mr Johnson moves the adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr Brown from the standing committee on general government presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill 95, An Act to provide for the passing of vital services by-laws by the City of North York / *Projet de loi 95, Loi prévoyant l'adoption par la cité de North York de règlements municipaux relatifs aux services essentiels.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

Shall Bill 95 be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Mr Paul Johnson from the standing committee on finance and economic affairs presented the committee's report on pre-budget consultations 1994 and preliminary response to the Fair Tax Commission and moved the adoption of its recommendations.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Do you have any statement to make?

**Mr Paul R. Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings):** I'd like to thank the hard work of the clerk, Lynn Mellor, and certainly the research officer, Elaine Campbell, who again has done a good job in helping us assemble this report. I also want to thank all the many witnesses for their very valuable presentations made before the committee.

I move adjournment of the debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Mr Johnson moves the adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr Eddy from the standing committee on social development presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill 119, An Act to prevent the Provision of Tobacco to Young Persons and to Regulate its Sale and Use by others / *Projet de loi 119, Loi visant à empêcher la fourniture de tabac aux jeunes et à en réglementer la vente et l'usage par les autres.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

Shall Bill 119 be ordered for third reading? No? Committee of the whole.

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr Marchese from the standing committee on adminis-



tration of justice presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee recommends that Bill 20, An Act to protect the Persons, Property and Rights of Tenants and Landlords, be not reported.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed? No.

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like to address the motion, if that's in order, and we believe it is, with respect to the recommendation dealing with Bill 20, a bill that I introduced in the Legislature in 1993. It passed second reading in this House and went to the standing committee on administration of justice.

The bill dealt with the concerns of tenants right across this province but especially in the Metropolitan Toronto area—tenants and police officers, I might add, as well—and it attempted to add an additional tool for the crown, for landlords and concerned tenants with respect to the ability to evict convicted drug dealers from apartment dwellings in this province.

The bill failed in the committee when it was not supported by government representatives on the committee. If you set aside the NDP fronts and the landlords, the people who appeared before us in an objective way were very much supportive of the legislation.

I want to say that the witnesses who appeared—and I will identify a couple of them who I think were nothing more than fronts for the NDP party. It was some of the most offensive testimony that I've heard in my years in this Legislature. We have seen some difficult things occur in terms of being inappropriate testimony that has been arranged, I believe, by the current government, witnesses who've appeared and given the government line, but this was perhaps the most offensive.

I suggested that at least two of the witnesses appearing before us misled a standing committee of the Legislature, and I want to mention the two groups specifically: the Parkdale legal aid clinic and the East York Tenants' Association. The language during their testimony was offensive, insulting, and in terms of questions answered by members, the representative from the Parkdale legal aid clinic indicated, and it's in Hansard, that in his view there was no serious problem with drug dealers in apartment dwellings in the Parkdale area. He also said that the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority was dealing in a very adequate fashion in terms of eviction of drug dealers in Metropolitan Toronto housing. Both of those claims were proven to be false when we had independent and objective witnesses appear before us later.

The East York Tenants' Association also indicated that there was no problem in their view. The only problems apparently were with landlords. They could see no problem with drug dealers.

1520

The concerns that both of these groups raised—and I want to put them on the record, because these concerns were supported by the NDP representatives on the justice committee. The concerns they expressed were not the concerns about tenants and families and children living in

apartment buildings who have to have drug dealers running through their apartments, concern about dirty needles in their communities etc; what the NDP members were concerned about was the violation of drug dealers' rights. This was a concern expressed: a violation of the human rights of drug dealers.

Another comment made, again supported by the NDP members of the justice committee, was that by evicting drug dealers from apartment buildings, convicted drug dealers, this was cruel and unusual punishment; it was cruel and unusual punishment for convicted drug dealers to be evicted from public housing. These people are being subsidized by the taxpayers in terms of public housing, but the NDP and their cronies who appeared before us said that this eviction would be cruel and unusual punishment.

Mr Winninger, the lead man on the NDP tag team, suggested that—

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I sat in on that committee and I was party to the proceedings and I can tell you—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Runciman:** I know that particular member has tenants in his own riding who are very much concerned about this problem, but it certainly wasn't expressed by him during the hearings. In fact, he was absent most of the time.

I want to say that even the point man for the NDP, and he had some difficulty with me in respect to this matter during the hearings—

**Mr Perruzza:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would ask once again that when he refers to members of the public who come to appear before the committees as "cronies," that's absolutely and totally inappropriate. I was there. They were intelligent—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I did not hear the comment and I will not render any judgement. The member for Leeds-Grenville. And please don't interfere with the debate.

**Mr Runciman:** Mr Speaker, I could rise on a point of privilege, because I think it's unfortunate. I'm trying to express a point of view that I think is representative of a significant number of Ontarians. Certainly, the justice committee, both the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party, expressed this concern—

**Mr Perruzza:** Mr Speaker, would you rule me out of order if I called them wide-eyed lunatics?

**Mr Runciman:** —and that member keeps interrupting me because he would not represent his own tenants' views in this committee and now he doesn't want me to represent the views of many, many Ontarians in respect to this very important issue.

Mr Winninger, the member for London South, as I said, was the point man for his membership on the committee. One of his major concerns—and I'm not quoting directly, but we straightened this out in Hansard and I'll re-read Hansard if he wishes me to do so if he



gets up on a point of order—was, again, he felt these people convicted and evicted had the right to ply their trade if they so chose, and he expressed sympathy.

**Mr David Winninger (London South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think that if the member is going to quote from Hansard, he should quote in the entire context. I never suggested even remotely what the member is attributing to me.

**Mr Runciman:** Part of what the member says is fair comment in the sense that I was unable to get my hands on Hansard, and I would be glad to put that in a statement in the future in the House in the proper context. Certainly in my view there was nothing to apologize for in committee in respect to that interpretation, but I take what he says as fair and I will indeed put the appropriate quotation in Hansard at a later date.

We heard about concerns. Someone said the landlords can deal with these things, and tenant organizations. We heard testimony of tenant organizations being taken over by drug dealers. We heard about tenants and landlords being intimidated by these kinds of individuals.

We had a detective from the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force who appeared before us and talked at length about the significant problem in Metropolitan Toronto Housing in respect to these kinds of activities. He talked about an explosion occurring in a high-rise in a Metro Toronto Housing building last year, I think it was. Luckily, it did not result in significant fatalities but it very easily could have. Some of these dealers occupy three or four apartments. They're using one of the apartments to mix their drugs, they're using the other apartment to arrange deals and the third apartment is for money collection.

Of course this detective also pointed out that Parkdale was the most critical area in terms of Metropolitan Toronto police and drug dealers in apartment dwellings, although we had a witness supposedly representing the legal aid clinic in Parkdale saying it wasn't a problem. Well, the Metropolitan Toronto police say Parkdale is the most serious problem area.

We also had the same representative, whom the NDP takes offence at me calling a crony of its party, appear before us and say MTHA had no problem in terms of evicting these kinds of individuals. We had two board members from the MTHA appear: a past chair, who was fired from her job because she was too much of an activist in terms of questions like this, and a current board member; both are current board members. We also had a tenant from MTHA. They talked about the horrible conditions that many tenants have to live under, the harassment, the intimidation, dirty needles in hallways, all sorts of activities occurring in these buildings, and tenants simply can't get any action taken. We had one tenant appear before us who talked about his wife being murdered by drug dealers, apartments being boarded up because of security concerns because of the activities of drug dealers in these buildings.

I now have the opportunity to put Mr Winninger's comments on the record as he said them. I am quoting from Hansard, Mr Winninger expressing concern about convicted drug dealers being evicted from apartment

dwellings: "This is aside from all the other concerns about their moving on to other residences and plying their trade elsewhere, if that's their inclination," "their trade" being the selling of illicit drugs to the youth of this province.

**Mr Winninger:** On a point of order.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** How can you have a point of order about Hansard?

**Mr Winninger:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would ask Mr Runciman, if he's going to be referring to excerpts from Hansard, to refer to the entire context, which will show quite clearly that my suggestion was that evicting a drug dealer from one residence and moving him to another is not going to solve the problem.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. If you want to rebut his comments, you'll have 30 minutes to do so, like he has.

**Mr Runciman:** I'm going to take the member up on his suggestion, because I think it's appropriate that perhaps we put a few more of his words on the record, and I'll do it briefly, but this is the concern—

**The Deputy Speaker:** No, on a point of order, the member for Bruce.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It's not normal that we have a series of interruptions, and I apologize for interrupting, but at the time when there have been now four interruptions by the New Democrats on this intervention, I would ask that you add three minutes to the speaking time of my colleague the member for Leeds-Grenville because they have been incessant in their interruptions on the same matter, and I suspect there is an awful lot of support for that being the case.

**The Deputy Speaker:** No, there won't be any change. The time allocated is 30 minutes for each individual on each party, so I will respect that procedure. I would ask the opposition please to remain quiet, and if you want to debate, you can do so afterwards; you have 30 minutes to do so.

**Mr Runciman:** I want to take up Mr Winninger's request, the NDP member for London South, that I put his comments on the record, because when I look at some more of his comments I think indeed they should be on the record for all the public of Ontario to appreciate what he was saying.

1530

He's talking about context here. We have to remember he's talking about sympathy for convicted drug dealers; that's what we're talking about. Mr Winninger says, "Why would you somehow put these people in double jeopardy?" Convicted drug dealers; he's expressing concern about putting convicted drug dealers, people peddling drugs to the young children across this province, in double jeopardy. That's a priority concern for the NDP and Mr Winninger. He says, once they've served their sentence, once they're ready to re-enter society, why shouldn't they have a residence to go back to? This is aside from all the other concerns and plying their trade elsewhere, if that's their inclination.



It's clear what he said. I make no apologies for it. If anyone should be apologizing to his constituents, to the people of Ontario—read it, Mr Speaker. Everyone in Ontario, get a copy of Hansard and read it and you interpret it. Mr Winninger, the member for London South, the NDP point man on the justice committee, was expressing very strong sympathy and concern for convicted drug dealers, not for tenants who have to live with these people, not for landlords who can't get them out of their buildings, not for the Metro Toronto police who have to deal with these people on an annual and daily basis. No, his concern was for convicted drug dealers. That is disgusting, nothing less than disgusting.

I said, when I came back to this session, that I wasn't going to get worked up about issues like this. I'm going to take a breath and calm down, because I have great difficulty in understanding the NDP on issues like this, where they're coming from in terms of the concerns they express. It's unbelievable.

I talked to some of the backbench members who served on the standing committee on justice after the second day of hearings. I said: "Why in the world are you opposing this legislation? I simply can't understand your reasoning." A member said to me, "We're following marching orders."

**Interjection:** Told how to vote.

**Mr Runciman:** They were told how to vote on this legislation. That's not only insulting to them as individual members—they're prepared to accept it, obviously—but it should be offensive to the people in their ridings whom they purport to represent and to the people across this province whom, as the government, they purport to represent. They're simply not standing up for the concerns of so many, many people.

The testimony we heard in the last day of hearings of this committee—members can attest to this—was heartrending. We had a man who had lost his wife break down in tears. His wife had died in his arms, murdered by a drug dealer. His daughter was abducted and held hostage for four days, raped a number of times, by drug dealers in Metropolitan Toronto Housing.

But again, you might as well speak to a wall as try to get this message across to the NDP and its members on the committee. They had come in there with set marching orders and it didn't matter what kind of testimony was heard. It didn't matter how heartrending, how convincing, how persuasive. It simply was to be ignored, and that was a fact. This has to be of significant concern to all of us in this Legislature.

I mentioned I was deeply offended by the fact that a number of witnesses who appeared before the committee had obviously and clearly been arranged through the NDP. They appeared there, purporting to represent tenants, which they did not do. They represented the NDP position on this legislation, and that's all.

**Mr Stockwell:** On the payroll.

**Mr Runciman:** These organizations apparently have some funding mechanism. I don't know what the reason is, but it was clearly offensive because of the testimony that followed from the Metro Toronto police, from

tenants themselves, from other witnesses who had no vested interest, very objective and clearly concerned people who live this kind of life on a day-to-day basis, who have to live with drug dealers in their neighbourhoods, who have to live with drug dealers down the hall, who are afraid to put their children out into the hall or out into the yards of these apartment buildings because of the activities that are going on.

We heard about lobbies of apartment buildings. You have to be in by 8 o'clock in some of these buildings. Otherwise, it's too dangerous because the lobbies are taken over by drug dealers. That's a reality out there today. That's a reality which the NDP and the committee members chose to ignore.

This is an unusual process in terms of requiring this report to come back, reporting not to report, but we felt it was so important that we discuss this issue that we're following through on this process. We intend to continue to pursue it. When another incident occurs in a Metropolitan Toronto Housing property, we're going to continue to raise this issue and the position the NDP members took and the position the NDP government took in respect to concern about tenants in this province and concern about Metro Toronto police, who have to go into these buildings and try to deal with these problems.

We think it's a sad day when the NDP, simply for political reasons, I gather, because I cannot understand any rationale other than the fact this bill was proposed by a Conservative member, an opposition member—what other possible reason could they have for rejecting legislation? We proposed a number of amendments to address their concerns and witnesses and they still continued to reject it. The only rhyme or reason we can appreciate at this stage is because it was introduced by an opposition member.

That's totally inappropriate. Their actions are, again, ones they will pay for when the electorate finally has an opportunity to express its views. They simply have a propensity for doing things which certainly are not in the best interests of Ontarians. I think that in terms of Bill 20, all of them, every last member of the NDP, should be ashamed of the votes their members cast on Bill 20.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further debate? The member for Bruce.

**Mr Elston:** Mr Speaker, are there questions and comments on this or just debate?

**The Deputy Speaker:** No questions or comments.

**Mr Elston:** Okay, thank you. I will just add a few words, not so much to carry on about the bill itself—I think the member for Leeds-Grenville has given his piece on that—but a little bit about what I see to be a very unfortunate occurrence in this particular committee. Private members' time is one of those areas in the House where there apparently is a truce among the members. We have an hour at which point a private member has a chance to put his or her particular piece of legislation before the entire chamber so that we can pass judgement as a unit on the merits of a private member's bill.

Much has been made recently by the government of its endeavour to pass pieces of legislation which have



received the nod of approval by the entire chamber. The member for Leeds-Grenville was one of the people who fortunately was able to have his bill moved on second reading, approved by the chamber as a whole, the people who were here. It was then agreed by the government, and that's a big hurdle for us to get over at times, to have it ordered for committee time.

I think it would have been assumed that had the government ordered it for committee time and had it received the nod of all the people here in the House, there would have been a report back from the committee that would have maybe suggested some amendments, that might have refined it, that might have done something to change some of the provisions, because that is well within the contemplated activity in committee.

At no time would we have thought, when the truce had been declared around private members' time, that the committee would have ganged up on this private member's time along partisan lines to put an end to this legislation. That seems to me to be the most blatant and most violent abrogation of the truce around private members' time that we could have.

There are a couple of other ways the government can kill private members' legislation. The person currently sitting in the Speaker's chair may very well contemplate, for instance, that there is a refusal by the government to move on a bill that he sponsored some three years ago now, the so-called cheque-cashing bill. It has been waiting for third reading. It went through committee, got its approval on second reading, got its approval at committee and is now sitting or languishing—we pass a motion every time we prorogue this place to have it survive—in a type of legislative twilight zone where it continues to exist, but on a plane which is not accessible by the real world. That's another way this government could have demonstrated a refusal to proceed with this particular legislation.

1540

I know that it is well within the authority of the majority members, in this case all New Democrats, of this committee to refuse to report any part of the bill back to this House, back to this chamber, for us to consider as a whole legislative body. But it is, in my view, presumptuous that when the Legislative Assembly, the entire chamber, has spoken on a private member's bill, the committee, but six individuals in this House, should suppose they have the authority to put an end to any legislative consideration of an item which on principle received the approval of this chamber.

That is the type of manipulation of this chamber which I think should be held in some high degree of disregard by the public of this province. Six members of this chamber have said no to a bill that on principle has passed on second reading in this House, and they have offered not one explanation to the collective chamber as to why they have taken it upon themselves to put an end to this private member's desired legislative scheme.

Do you know something, Mr Speaker? It is not, when it comes for passage on second reading, just this member's scheme any longer, because the House as a whole has adopted it as a principle that is well worth pursuing.

So while the ownership belongs to my colleague from Leeds-Grenville, the House has adopted the principle as one that we should explore and develop further if that is required. But why is it, and particularly with respect to private members' time when the truce has been declared among all the House under the auspices of the standing orders, that these six people will remain unaccountable to the chamber as a whole, merely by making a motion with their larger number of members and passing a motion to kill a bill which in principle has been approved by the whole chamber?

Mr Speaker, I don't understand. I don't understand what it is the government hopes to achieve by using six thugs in dealing with this particular—I withdraw the word "thugs"—six people who are following the orders of the hierarchy of the New Democrats to put an end to this particular legislation. How is it that those six people will remain for ever unaccountable to all of us, because none of them stood up when they had a chance on their 30-minute time to explain why they put an end to this bill? They merely, at the behest of somebody who shall remain nameless and faceless, used the member for London South to put the message that no longer will this bill survive for legislative consideration in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

I don't understand why they chose to flex their legislative muscle in this regard. I think the bill ought to come back for committee of the whole discussion if there is something that is totally out of whack as far as those six people are concerned. I don't think those six people should have the right to tell the chamber that they have put an end to a bill for which this chamber says, "You, as committee members, will consider this legislation."

I am asking the members of the New Democratic Party in this chamber to put an end to this type of blatant end to the piece around private members' time. They have it within their authority right at this moment, or as soon as this debate ends, to put an end to that type of high-handed, heavy-handed committee activity around private members' time. You can vote to disregard the report of the majority NDP membership on this committee and you can say, "This bill ought to be reported back with amendments," if that's what you like, but that it ought to come back for further consideration either in committee of the whole or on third reading.

It would seem to me that probably the best line would either be to have this thing referred back to the committee for further work and bring it forward again for us to consider in committee of the whole or to have it brought directly into committee of the whole where we can talk about the reasons why the government feels that this private member's initiative should not proceed as it was originally planned by this chamber. I don't understand what there is to lose for the government in that regard.

I don't understand what it is that was so bad about this piece of legislation that shouldn't have been brought up at the very time this received second reading. If it's a matter of principle, it's at second reading that those six people should have stood on their feet and said, "This bill should not go further and we're voting against it."

If there was something in principle wrong with this

bill, the minister responsible for the Solicitor General's department, or for the Housing ministry, or for photo-radar, the Minister of Transportation, any of these people, should have stood on their feet and said in principle: "We are opposed to this bill and we are not going to do anything further with it. We are killing it on principle because we are against dealing with drug dealers in this fashion."

How is it that when a committee receives an order from this House to deal with a bill, six people alone of the 130 who represent the province of Ontario can say, "There is nothing further that will be considered on this because, as a matter of principle, we six don't like this"? That's what they're saying. I don't think these people should assume that they should carry the day. They should report the bill back. It's well within their limits to report the bill back unamended, and then we could have the debate around committee of the whole.

You know something? The minister, the Solicitor General or the Attorney General or the Minister of Finance or the Premier can come in here and pooh-pooh the things that have been proposed by the member from Leeds. They can say the whole chamber, upon sober second reflection, or whatever it is they want to say they've had, has changed its mind. They can go through the debate item by item and say, "We no longer support the ideas put forward by the member for Leeds and are prepared now to put an end to it," but the entire Legislative Assembly ought to have that choice.

It seems to me that in this regard the government members should come on side with democracy and allow the chamber to speak about the bill. It should in fact not recommend that the bill not be reported back to us but that the bill should be reported back to us for further consideration. The entire chamber was able to make the consideration on second reading, and the entire chamber ought to be offered the opportunity to put its case in this regard.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** The entire chamber will get the opportunity.

**Mr Elston:** The House leader says the entire chamber will get their opportunity. Well, that is not true. The only thing up for debate right now is not the issues inside the bill. The entire debate on the report right now is, shall the bill not be reported? That is an infringement of the types of activities this chamber has undertaken in private members' time. They have really tripped over the power lines on this particular issue.

It's not the first time it's happened. It isn't the first time muscle has been flexed in the committee structure in the intercession. I was there with my colleagues the members for Mississauga North, for Carleton and a couple of others, the member for Dufferin-Peel, when we were talking about the appointment of the Environmental Commissioner. It was a bit strange that for that one particular item the government dropped a new person into the committee, who attended on one particular morning for only the time it took him to put the government's case, and the rest of the people fell in line like a bunch of rookies at a hockey training camp.

It was an interesting exercise. This fellow just appeared

at the door, the aura preceding him to his chair, and held forth about why an Environmental Commissioner should be chosen in the manner the government told him. He said—I heard him say—"I have been advised that this is the way it should be done," and all the rookies at the table bowed to the superior information of the member for Windsor-Walkerville as they voted with their hands and said, "Oh yes, if Bob Rae wants it that way, I'm following." That's the second example of how this New Democratic Party has used its power to throw away the traditions of this place.

Well, here is another one, except this one is even more blatant, in the sense that if you happen to compare the Hansard from the Legislative Assembly committee in which the member for Chatham-Kent was a member and said: "I want to do my work, I want to represent my constituents in choosing this Environmental Commissioner. I want to exercise my authority"—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. The debate is being conducted by the member for Bruce. If you want to make any comments, you can take your seat and do so. I would ask the House to refrain from shouting.

1550

**Mr Elston:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I just repeat myself. The member for Chatham-Kent was in the Legislative Assembly committee saying: "I want to make the choice. All of us should have the opportunity to make this decision about the Environmental Commissioner. I want to represent my constituents." And you know something? A lesser number of individuals, a subcommittee doing that work, was unacceptable to the member for Chatham-Kent, and not only to the member for Chatham-Kent but the member for Sault Ste Marie and about three others of the four who actually spoke. The fourth person who spoke, the member for Windsor-Walkerville, of course was the person who delivered the edict from the central authority. The politburo spoke, and these underlings all marched lockstep into the place and voted to say, "This larger number should undertake the decision."

But if you compare that Hansard with what has just gone on here, here there are six individuals who have received instructions from the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, 130 of us who have said: "Please do the work on this bill and bring it back to us. Refine it if you have to, hear witnesses if you have to, but bring it back to us and report." Well, do you know what those six have taken unto themselves? They have said, in spite of five people voting in favour of this legislation and in spite of the fact that in principle the Legislative Assembly of Ontario has said this bill ought to progress through the system: "We six are all-knowing. We are the individuals who are making the final decision for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. We have decided in principle that the rest of those people were wrong in letting this bill come to us, so we six, alone of the 130, have decided that we hold the upper hand and we are going to put an end to it."

That shouldn't happen. Why doesn't the New Democratic Party admit it was a tactical error, that it was bad and that it should bring that bill back—as it exists, if it doesn't want to amend it? They should bring it back into



this House and amend it in committee of the whole or deal with it in third reading, but put on the record, publicly on the record so that all can see and hear as we debate this bill, either in committee of the whole or on third reading, why it is that they have had a change of heart on this. The minister ought to have enough gumption that she or he stand in their place and put their side of the issue on the record.

None of this will send the messenger so that he can be dealt with by the public, in a way that may not be very satisfactory, from their point of view. But the minister ought to have the ability to accept responsibility for having sent the emissary in the first place to put an end to this bill. Why is it, if we took the time to debate it and pass it on second reading, that the people who are opposed to it in the government haven't got the stamina to identify themselves and identify clearly on the record why they want this bill ended? If that's what you want done, do it publicly and up front. None of this reporting back to the legislative chamber that we don't want to do anything any more with it. We should have a full-scale debate like we had on second reading.

What principle is it that has changed in this bill, that has determined now for the government that it no longer wants to pursue it? I haven't heard what it is, but there obviously is one. There is a rationale that ought to be put on the record of the full assembly, not just to be brought in that this bill dies in committee.

That's all I can really say in relation to this debate. The debate is one of style, it is one about the substance, it is one that may have demonstrated that the government has had a change of heart. If in fact they have had a change of heart, they should put that change of heart on the same public record in which they originally supported this legislation. They should come to this forum as a whole and tell us why it is that in principle they supported this bill on second reading and why now—on principle, I guess, or whatever other reason—they have determined to deep-six this thing.

It's within the power of the individual members of the New Democratic Party caucus, if they feel responsible towards this process, that they now vote to have the bill come back to us. It's not a tough vote. We just have to reject the report which says the bill will no longer be dealt with, bring it back and deal with it up front, deal with it in this chamber and confront head-on the reasons.

The easiest thing for the New Democrats in this regard probably is to kill the bill on the report. Do you know why? None of these people over in the New Democratic Party will have to tell us why it was that they are against this bill. It's easy to hide behind those six individuals who put an end to this bill as it now stands. If you are timid as legislators—I know some of you are not—you will vote in favour of the report as read to us by the member for Fort York, but if you desire to have an airing of the reasons you want this vote ended, if you care about that being put on this public record, you will oppose the motion brought forward by the Chairman of that committee. It's a very large step to take.

If you are timid, if you don't want to tell your constituents why you don't want to deal with this issue, hide

behind the six. But if you really mean what you say—I've read a number of your constituency letters, I have listened to a number of your speeches, I've read the press releases of I don't know how many of you New Democrats, and if you really are going to continue sending that stuff out, then the only way you can vote on this motion today is no.

You, Mr Speaker, are here at a watershed in how democratic the New Democratic Party really is. Will the secretive types, the small group of hired guns who put an end to a piece of legislation, govern the way this chamber operates, or will the entire chamber be able to deliberate about the bill to which we earlier gave the nod? Thank you for your time.

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** I want to thank the speaker who just commented for his contribution. Even though he wasn't a member of the committee, he did seem to capture the flavour and the concerns of that debate.

I did, however, have the privilege to support my colleague Mr Runciman from Leeds-Grenville as I supported his private member's bill. Just so everybody is aware of what exactly the bill is, it was Bill 20, An Act to protect the Persons, Property and Rights of Tenants and Landlords.

I was very deeply concerned about the apparent tactical manoeuvre by the NDP members of this committee, which I will share with the House in a little more detail. I was concerned, as my colleague Mr Runciman was concerned, about the apparent support that may have been given under questionable circumstances by the government for this bill, only to have it in a manner scuttled, at great expense to taxpayers.

I will say this. At least the previous government, the Liberal government, when it did not want to support something, had the courage to say, "I don't want to support it." Just in this area of justice and victims' rights, at a time when Ontario was the last province in Canada to have a victims' bill of rights, I recall that the Liberals defeated that, but they had the courage to stand up in the House and say they were not going to bring in a victims' bill of rights.

The NDP two years ago stood up in this House on my private member's bill on a justice issue, had the courage to stand up and say, "We don't support victims' rights and we're not going to support a bill."

This is a serious matter, when the business of the House can be consumed with a private member's bill. When the government isn't committed to those reforms, it should say so. First of all, it is apparently misleading to the public, because on the day of a private member's bill, it is announced with much fanfare that the bill received all-party support.

In fairness, on the day this bill in question was debated in this House and voted on, it received the support of the member for Yorkview, Mr Mammoliti. He has a serious problem in his riding. He is listening to his tenants, and he stood in his place as a member of the governing party, but independent, hopefully, under the rules of private members' hour, and spoke in support of the bill.

1600

Mr Winner got to his feet when his time came and he spoke against it. But if the government was committed to stopping this bill, why did it allow for a long, expensive process, taking up valuable time on the justice committee—incidentally, there are three or four other bills that the justice committee would like to be dealing with—wasting thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money? When the time came, when we'd finished the public consultation on this bill, the NDP didn't even support the amendments which would strengthen this bill. In other words, when you look at Hansard for this committee, it's a remarkable reading of Hansard. Every vote was a recorded vote. Every vote demonstrates very clearly the government's lack of interest in or support for the democratic process of committee work.

One of the reasons we're having a debate on the floor today on this bill is because the government simply had, with its controlling majority on this committee, the marching orders and the power to kill this bill. That has an impact on how we operate this House, if it's to be a democratic extension of the will of the people. The government has the right to bring forward government bills at will, but this was a private member's bill which the House, by majority vote, sent to a committee to spend money on, to research, to bring in expert witnesses on, to refine it, to amend it and to return it here.

What is the motion from the Chair of the justice committee today, by a recorded vote of all six members of the NDP against the bill? It was that it's not a priority for the NDP. "Let's just kill the bill; let's just cover it in dust and maybe it'll go away."

I ask the members of the government who are here today to examine what this bill would do. First of all, the government should be pleased that this is the kind of initiative to make our communities safer, to support law-abiding citizens, whether they're tenants or landlords or land owners, any citizens, over the growing rights and privileges that criminals enjoy in this province and in this country.

On this issue we should have unanimity and we should be able to seek support, but we didn't get one ounce of cooperation or one ounce of interest coming out of the government. Here are some of the objections we heard. I want to remind members that there was considerable expense to taxpayers for this committee to meet, that several deputants came many miles in order to make presentations, many of these presentations eight, nine or 10 pages long, thoughtful documents, thoughtful arguments on legal points about the constitutionality of it, how intrusive this would be into our courts of justice system.

Right off the bat, the NDP's first argument was: "This is an attack on tenants. It unfairly targets tenants for eviction." The truth of the matter is that we heard cogent testimony that there are all sorts of federal and provincial legislation that impounds the assets and the property of criminals in their activities.

Your own government, through regulation when the House wasn't sitting, brought in seizure powers for those people smuggling tobacco. The principle of taking away

a criminal's property has been going on for years. The criminals are getting smarter. Why would they buy a house and open it up as a crack house when the government and taxpayers will subsidize them in government-run housing units? All they do is walk away from it after they've damaged it.

The government missed the whole point. It wasn't an attack on tenants. My colleague Mr Runciman was responding to the legitimate concerns of tenants. I'm going to read into the record one brief comment from one of the tenants whose experience was heart-wrenching, was deeply disturbing to anyone who has a family or has any sense of decency, who couldn't avoid but be supportive of this bill after hearing this.

We heard the other problem for the NDP: It'll only attack 20% to 30% of the drug dealers in Ontario. This is mind-boggling. According to the NDP government of Ontario, we shouldn't be wasting our time here because we're only going to get 20% to 30% of the drug cases dealt with in the lower court. Aside from the fact that we had proposed amendments to fix that, aside from the fact that we heard cogent testimony from a police officer who spends his life going after criminals who are drug dealers, aside from the fact that these people are marketing death in our projects, in our housing units all across Metro Toronto primarily, we were told by those Metro drug officers that the 20% to 30% represents the most serious drug dealer offences in this province, and yet there was no support and no political will from this government of the NDP for this simple law-and-order issue and to provide protection for those families and children living in those rental units.

We mentioned that the government seemed misinformed that there would be victims' impact statements that went routinely towards court and that a judge could consider restraining orders in other matters. This simply did not square. First of all, victims do not have rights in this province, thanks to the NDP and the Liberals defeating that motion. Secondly, victims don't have a say in a drug dealer case because of the manner in which the offence is approached by the crown.

Where the victim appears is when they go to their landlord and they say, "I'm being victimized," and the landlord says: "Fine. If there's a criminal activity, I'll go for an eviction, but you come forward and testify in court. We won't offer you any protection." There will be no protection because if you read the testimony, case after case after case, the criminal has his lawyer down there in no time flat. He's back out on the street before the police are finished interviewing the witness whom they're trying to build their case on.

We heard testimony from several legal aid clinics which talked about the civil libertarian rights of criminals in this province. They actually came forward and, with the support of the NDP—which is what my colleague's comments were about, this apparent arrangement of likemindedness on the issues of "A tenant is a tenant is a tenant whether they break the law or not," that they have a right to live somewhere.

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** There were independent witnesses.



**Mr Jackson:** There were lots of witnesses, Mr Sutherland, and if you'd participated in more of the discussion and more of the bill, you would have been aware of the independence of a lot of the witnesses, but the ones from the legal aid clinics came forward with testimony which indicated—

**Mr Sutherland:** Oh, only ones that agree with you.

**Mr Jackson:** They don't have to agree with me. I'm disturbed when the police of the day, they can't agree with; they call them racist. I'm disturbed when tenants come forward who have lost family members, Mr Sutherland, and when they've lost a family member and politicians are saying, "This is an important issue," right to their face; that was not a pleasant experience in committee.

When we asked these legal aid clinics, "You're predominantly assisting tenants in this province?" they said yes. We said, "How many times would a tenant come forward to you to complain about illegal activities?" They said, "Not very often." I said, "Well, when they do come forward, what advice do you give them?" In fact, I asked Raymond Kuszelewski from the Parkdale Community Legal Services, who was one of the presenters, what advice he gives to tenants who come to a legal aid clinic for legal assistance when there are criminal activities occurring in their residence.

The staff lawyer for Parkdale Community Legal Services indicated, and Hansard will bear this out, that what he avoids doing is telling tenants to call the police, because that's ratting on another tenant; that's informing on another tenant. What is more fundamental to justice in this province than for law-abiding citizens to state their case without fear of reprisal to anyone for their own public safety? Yet we have a legal aid clinic openly stating, "We don't recommend they go to the law."

Parkdale Community Legal Services receives its money from the taxpayers, from the very tenants whom it purports to serve and the very taxpayers who are watching this debate in the House today. That is the level of commitment from these kinds of legal aid clinics that were condemning the bill.

1610

I have to say that not only did I say it at the time, but my colleague Mr Runciman and I have asked the Chairman of the justice committee to write to the Attorney General of this province to ascertain if in fact these legal aid clinics are counselling tenants not to call the police. I consider that a serious matter and one which the Chair has agreed to undertake to bring to the attention of the Attorney General. Certainly, I find that inappropriate and I'd like the Attorney General of this province to clear that up.

We heard from Metro police, from their drug squad. We heard them indicate the nature and the depth of the drug activities that are occurring, the number of citizens who are at risk, the increases and the severe level of drugs. The police made a very helpful amendment to this bill. They recommended that section 1 of the bill include schedules G and H of the Food and Drugs Act for those manufactured chemical hallucinogenic drugs that are also

pervasive, and yet the NDP didn't think that was a good idea. The NDP said, "Chemical drugs, we're not going to worry about them," even though the police came forward and offered some good, sensible amendments.

Even Ray Kuszelewski from the Parkdale Community Legal Services came in and gave us two very positive recommendations. One was to parallel my colleague's bill with the Landlord and Tenant Act, and the NDP voted that down, something as simple as clarifying the parallel nature of the definition between the two acts, and yet the NDP had its marching orders: vote after vote after vote, denial, denial, denial, cannot support.

I've already indicated about the waste of money and the lack of courage on the part of the other members. We also heard from Norm Gardner, who was that day working on the Metro budget for police services. He left that to come down to Queen's Park; he felt that this issue was so important to public safety in this province.

Councillor Norm Gardner made the following suggestions: He suggested that this bill could even be stronger if it were to become extended to all other criminal activities like common gaming houses and bawdy houses, and that was recommended, and that the bill should be expanded to forbid the common use of properties for criminal activities and for their purposes.

He said, and I want to quote one briefly here, "By making these changes, the intent of the proposed bill would not only encompass the protection of tenants and landlords, but would also address and curtail the elements which support and allow criminal activities to flourish and thrive." That's what Norm Gardner had to say, if anybody on the government side cared to listen to him. He's a senior police commissioner, a senior councillor in Metro Toronto.

We also heard from June Rowlands, the mayor of Metro Toronto, who as well told this committee that this was important legislation that should be approved to help be a partner in the process of cleaning up the criminal elements that seem to hide in these larger rental high-rise buildings.

She says: "This proposed legislation would give landlords an additional tool as they try to maintain their premises and ensure the safety and security of their tenants. Therefore I urge the members to endorse Bill 20 and take whatever measures possible to ensure that it becomes the law in Ontario."

To simply dismiss the mayor of Toronto when deputant after deputant made cogent arguments about how badly needed it was, that the current eviction notice was not the simple method, that we needed to do what this bill purports to do, to fast-track evict criminals who are dealing in death and drugs and the spread of AIDS in these projects throughout Metro Toronto.

I'm going to finish by reading a commentary from one tenant, a Mr Frederick Hood, himself a resident in Metro Toronto housing. Mr Frederick Hood said the following: "I'm going to tell you something. It's a very sorrowful sight that you have to live around. One of my children lost one of their eyes because the crack dealers used to throw their beer bottles and their syringes out in front of

my house. I couldn't let my children go out. At that particular time, they were four years old, six years old, eight years old and a 15-year-old boy.

"Do you know what it's like to see your grandchildren go out in front of their house and you can't leave them out there? They get threatened to be kidnapped or people threaten to steal them. They took my daughter, as I said to you earlier, and they raped her for four days. She set herself on fire. They had to go to the nut house." That's the only place for her. "I've had custody of the children ever since. You don't know how frustrated and how angry I feel."

Mr Hood goes on to explain that his way of fighting back was to start a drug line for children in this specific Metro Toronto housing project, that he's trying to help the many children who are flocking to Toronto and hiding. He went on to suggest, as we received, that these kids are running from all over Ontario and coming to Toronto. I'm still quoting:

"They end up in Toronto housing because they can blend in, because everybody there is too scared to say anything. If you think these children run away and have safe hideaways—no way. MTHA is the only place you can go. You can hide anybody you want in there, and that's a shame. There are a lot of good tenants in Ontario housing, a lot, but they are victimized and they are terrorized."

In the final analysis, during Mr Hood's deputation, he pleaded with the members of the committee, in particular the six members of the NDP caucus who were hijacking this bill. He said that the two criminals who raped his daughter for four days were charged with forcible confinement and assault. They spent between 60 and 90 days behind bars, but today those two criminals are still the next-door neighbours in that Metro Toronto housing complex.

We plead with you, my colleague Mr Runciman and members of the Conservative caucus, to please allow this bill to come forward so that tenants like Frederick Hood and his family will know that this government cares enough about them as victims that it will not allow criminals to enjoy a further leg up, because we've sent a clear signal that in Ontario we do not understand how to correct the problem and to serve the rights of victims in Ontario.

**Mr Winninger:** I'm pleased to speak to this important issue as well. Perhaps at the outset I could state for the record that I and other government members of the standing committee on justice repeated their concern about the problem with cocaine, with crack and drug crimes, and in fact crimes of all sorts that affect tenants and other people living near dealers of cocaine and crack. At no time did we indicate that we didn't place any weight on the concerns of victims of crime. In fact, we support those victims of crime with their concerns.

What we did say, however, and it was repeated again and again by the witnesses who appeared before the standing committee, is that not only is this bill opportunistic, but it is, in the words of Kenneth Hale of the Tenant Advocacy Group—

**Mr Runciman:** Baloney. The only ones who said that were political hacks, specifically hacks for the NDP. You're misleading the House.

**Mr Winninger:** I note the member for Leeds-Grenville is trying to shout me down, but the facts and the Hansard speak for themselves.

**Mr Runciman:** A point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Order. The member for Leeds-Grenville on a point of order.

**Mr Runciman:** The speaker just said witness after witness said certain things, which is totally inaccurate. Only the front organizations for the NDP gave that line.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you.

**Mr Runciman:** Only the front organizations for the NDP.

**The Acting Speaker:** That's not a point of order.

**Mr Winninger:** I didn't expect to speak to this issue today, but the member for Leeds-Grenville was extremely provocative and I am responding.

I obtained a list of the speakers on the various days that the committee had its hearings. Mr Kenneth Hale, member of the Tenant Advocacy Group, South Etobicoke Community Legal Services, a man with experience and knowledge of the Landlord and Tenant Act, described this bill in very clear terms. He called it unconstitutional, he called it unconscionable and he called it unnecessary. For me, that description sums up a lot of the criticism that was advanced towards the bill.

1620

Even Mr Henry Verschuren, manager of legal services for Greenwin Property Management, speaking on behalf of landlords, expressed grave concern that Mr Runciman's act would dilute the powers vested on the court under the Landlord and Tenant Act and the recourse and redress that landlords enjoy under the Landlord and Tenant Act, because under section 107 of the Landlord and Tenant Act, any landlord, where a tenant is committing an illegal act on the premises or disturbing the quiet enjoyment of other tenants or poses a risk of serious harm to other tenants, can serve a notice—seven days to correct the action—and then proceed to evict the tenant.

What Mr Verschuren was concerned about was that Mr Runciman's bill, as it was introduced, would override the powers under the Landlord and Tenant Act. You would have to wait until after a conviction to proceed against a drug dealer for carrying out an illegal act. Furthermore, because the proceeding would be brought in criminal court, you'd have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the offender was guilty of the offence, whereas under the Landlord and Tenant Act any landlord can prove on a balance of probabilities that an illegal act has occurred and a landlord can then seek an order to terminate the tenancy and a writ of possession. So even the landlords, who you'd expect to support this bill, had grave concerns about some of the language in which it was couched. Not only was it unnecessary, it's unconstitutional.

The member for Leeds-Grenville introduced an amendment that he hoped would save the bill, and that amendment was that instead of allowing provincial court judges



to issue eviction orders in criminal proceedings, he would change that and only judges in the Ontario Court (General Division) would be allowed to issue such eviction orders.

While the member for Leeds-Grenville may have thought that this solved his constitutional problem, because provincial court judges don't have the power to evict tenants, and that's been made quite clear in the 1981 Residential Tenancies Act case, the General Division judges, who do presumably enjoy that discretion to issue orders to evict tenants, only hear approximately 10% of all drug cases. So you'd have 90% of the drug offenders, traffickers and so on coming through the provincial courts, to which this act wouldn't even apply.

They challenged my figures, and when Detective Sergeant Craig Hilborn of the Metropolitan Toronto Police central drug information unit came, at the request of Mr Runciman, he agreed that the majority of cases are dealt with in the provincial courts and this act wouldn't even apply to them. Of the so-called supporters of the bill, and I can think of two of them out of 20 or so who appeared over the course of the two days, one, representing the landlord, was concerned that he was wanting to supersede the Landlord and Tenant Act, which already offered the remedies they need, and the Metro drug sergeant was concerned that the majority of cases wouldn't even be heard by the General Division judges who could issue orders under this legislation.

The vast majority of presenters who appeared before the committee underlined the weaknesses of this statute for a variety of reasons. The tenants, in fact, for whom Mr Runciman introduced this bill, whom he alleges to protect, universally said that this was an attack on tenants. They said that property owners who may be drug dealers or harbour drug dealers wouldn't be affected by it, so why focus on tenants? The suggestion was made that this was for very insidious reasons, that it was to attack tenants. That was their concern.

Many other concerns were expressed about this bill, too numerous to mention here, but just to name a few: What is the point of evicting a convicted drug dealer's family? In many cases, as you know, Mr Speaker, drug dealers may prey on single mothers with families. What purpose does it serve society to evict those families along with the drug dealer? What purpose does it serve society to move a drug dealer on to another neighbourhood? What purpose does it serve to evict drug dealers? They have to live somewhere.

Mr Verschuren of Greenwin Property Management cited an illustration of how one of his landlords evicted a drug dealer from one side of the street and he turned up in another residential complex across the street.

It's foolish and silly for this kind of bill, which for me is only a political statement, to suggest that this is how you stamp out drug dealing. You stamp out drug dealing not by moving drug dealers on to another neighbourhood, not by evicting their innocent families; you deal with it through tough prison sentences. That's the key. No one in government or on the standing committee sitting as a member of government in any way criticizes tough penalties for drug dealers.

What it comes down to is this: We have the member for Leeds-Grenville introducing a private member's bill in the House, and that's of course his right and prerogative, fraught with constitutional problems, unnecessary, as even some of the landlord and police representatives suggest, and unconscionable in that it zeroes in on tenants, for one thing, zeroes in on innocent families of tenants, and doesn't pay any attention to drug dealers, who if they're successful presumably could afford to purchase their own properties.

At the end of the day, the government committee members had to ask themselves, "Is this bill salvageable, notwithstanding the amendments that were introduced?" The overriding opinion of the people who came before the committee, landlords, tenants, members of the public, was that this bill was unnecessary, unconscionable and unconstitutional, and to my view opportunistic. Why should the committee waste this House's time by reporting it back? We listened very carefully to the submissions before the standing committee and the overwhelming opinion before that committee, and Mr Runciman certainly can't refute this, spoke in opposition to the bill.

**Mr Jackson:** That's misleading. Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Burlington South on a point of order.

**Mr Jackson:** The point of order is simply this, Mr Speaker: The speaker opposite is quoting the overwhelming majority. The truth is that the Toronto housing authority is the largest tenant organization in all of Canada, and they and their tenants and their directors presented support for this bill. So the member's comments are misleading and I bring that to the House's attention.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for London South may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Winninger:** Just to complete my remarks, quite clearly Hansard will speak for itself. When you read Hansard in its totality—

**Mr Elston:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In fairness, the word "misleading" is not allowed in this House. I don't think we can skip by that or we're going to get ourselves into trouble. I think the member should withdraw that word.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member is not even on the right side. Would the honourable member have withdrawal, please.

**Mr Jackson:** I thought I raised it in a point of order, and I didn't raise it during debate.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Jackson:** No, I raised it as a point of order; I didn't raise it in debate.

**The Acting Speaker:** Do you wish to withdraw it? I did not particularly hear the emphasis on "misleading." If you did say "misleading," it is not parliamentary.

**Mr Jackson:** I'll withdraw it.

1630

**Mr Winninger:** In conclusion, the remarks made by the presenters before the standing committee will speak

for themselves. Those members of the House who choose to take the time to review the record in Hansard will see indisputable evidence opposing Bill 20, not just from tenants, not just from members of the public, but also from landlords; and, actually, evidence from the police staff that they had grave concerns that this would just move a drug dealer from one neighbourhood to another.

In sum, I think it entirely appropriate that the report was phrased the way it was to the House. I hope members will not be swayed by some of the comments made by the member for Burlington South and the member for Leeds-Grenville which would suggest a pattern of events and evidence that simply did not occur.

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** I don't plan to speak long, perhaps five minutes at the most, but I feel obligated to stand and talk a little about Yorkview and the experience at Jane and Finch, the experience that has plagued us, quite frankly, for a long time.

I must say, we're no longer plagued. The Jane and Finch community has certainly improved. The most recent statistics at 31 Division, I understand, are that almost 50% of the crime related to drugs has been reduced over the last three years. It's been reduced for a number of reasons.

(1) Some of the drug dealers who had plagued the community have now moved to a different location, a different area of the city. You'll note from some reports from the police department that this in essence has happened.

(2) Prevention and early intervention have been wonderful in my riding of Yorkview. We are now able to get to those who are addicted to the substance, those who need the most help, those who are most vulnerable and need some rehabilitation. That's happening throughout Yorkview. That, in my opinion, is a response to one of the members on the other side who said this government isn't doing anything. This government has spent more money at the corner of Jane and Finch and in Yorkview over the last three years than any other government has spent on early intervention and drug rehabilitation or any of the education components that are attached to all of this in our schools.

**Mr Stockwell:** What's your point?

**Mr Mammoliti:** The member asks, "What's your point?" My point is that this government has reacted and has reacted in a positive way, has given us the moneys that are necessary to try to get those statistics down, and it has worked. We keep hearing about MTHA. The fact is that this government gave MTHA, if I'm not mistaken, well over \$600,000 to renovate its lobbies and to put in security systems and to put in new locks and new doors and the upgraded panels, which has worked in Yorkview, has worked at Jane and Finch. When the member says this government hasn't done anything, I say to him that he doesn't know exactly what the government's done. As a matter of fact, it's because of this government's initiatives that the crime related to drugs in Yorkview has gone down almost 50% in the last three years.

Having said that, that doesn't mean I don't support the member. If you talk to any of the experts around drug

addiction or anybody who's involved with enforcement, they will tell you there are two components attached to trying to deal with these problems. One certainly is the early intervention and prevention aspect. Of course enforcement is the other. Enforcement in Yorkview has worked tremendously. The police department in Yorkview has taken a new approach and has done that for the last three years, and it's worked. You see a lot of them walking around trying to mingle, trying to talk with people, trying to find out who those drug dealers are and who the people who need the help are. The enforcement component in terms of how the police department is fighting those dealers and how it's actually working together with the judicial system to evict some of these people has worked to a degree.

That's where I would agree with this particular suggestion. Enforcement is important, and the government has tackled it as much as it can or to a degree where perhaps it can't any more; maybe there's some movement around there. But in terms of early intervention and prevention, we've done it.

Now it's time to act on the enforcement aspect of this. This is where I agree with this component. If we don't become vocal and if we don't become aware of what's been happening—not only in the MTHA complexes, I must tell you, but also some of the private buildings. I can tell you that in Yorkview MTHA has pretty much been cleaned up in comparison to some of the privately owned buildings that currently are plagued with the problem. Having said that, you must understand that while I was an employee of MTHA and also represented well over 1,000 employees at MTHA at one point, I stood firm on the enforcement aspect of what was happening there. It's not only an MTHA problem; it's a problem that exists within the system.

While some people will advocate that these technicalities might be an issue when it comes to eviction, I've been saying that we can't afford to wait for these types of technicalities when we talk about drug dealers. Drug dealers are in essence taking over some of our buildings in some of our communities. Jane and Finch was certainly one of them. Two years ago, if you drove along Jane Street to the corner of Jane and Finch, you would know exactly who the dealers were and who weren't. The dealers were those who were hanging around the lobbies, hanging around the corridors and of course intimidating those who were walking back and forth.

The question is posed, what does this do for that particular situation? From what I understand of the legislation that's being talked about here tonight, if somebody gets convicted of dealing drugs, that person could get evicted a lot easier than under what currently exists.

The benefit I see in that is that I would not put any drug dealer over any of the kids in our community or any of the children who have been witness to some of the dealings that have been going on. The quicker you deal with something, the quicker you react to that particular problem, in whatever way you react, the better it is for those children and those families. In some of the units I've seen over the last three years around Metro—around



Ontario, for that matter—I know drug dealers take over some of the empty units. We used to have to board up some of these units the drug dealers used to take over and sell their crack in. Crack houses is what they were called.

This might separate those dealers, for whom I have no sympathy whatsoever—and I must make that very clear. Those who believe we should have sympathy for those dealers because perhaps they're on some sort of substance themselves—there are a lot of people who think drug dealers are actually addicted to some sort of drug. Most of the dealers out there don't even touch the stuff and don't sell it for that reason. As a matter of fact, most of the dealers who are out on the streets in Metro and other parts of the province and other parts of the world, for that matter, are very much in control and know exactly what they're doing. Why? Because it's very profitable.

1640

**Mr Jackson:** Don't you think they should evict them?

**Mr Mammoliti:** The question is, should we evict the drug dealers and should there be a mechanism or a way of doing it a little more quickly, expeditiously? The answer is yes. I believe that we need to, for a number of reasons. I think that we need to do it because we need to save some of those children, some of those kids whom I have referred to earlier. I also believe that we need to send a very strong message to those dealers. Those dealers must know that we as a government, we as a society, aren't going to accept what these drug dealers are doing to our children. Unless we find a mechanism or a way of doing that, it's not going to happen.

There are some arguments that will be given—I'm sure they were given at committee—in terms of the Landlord and Tenant Act being that avenue, that mechanism to be able to get rid of these particular tenants. I can tell you that in my experience—again, I note that I represented well over 1,000 workers in MTHA, and I said this about six or seven years ago and I'm saying it now—MTHA and some of the other buildings across the province have had a difficult time evicting some of the people for those reasons. Why? Because they found that there may have been some sort of a technical difficulty in the judicial system, and for that reason the problems continued. The workers who were on the sites at one point asked me for bulletproof vests. I can remember advocating for bulletproof vests at a time when there were problems on those sites and other sites across the province.

Those concerns were legitimate. I mean, if you talked to some of the workers who worked in some of these buildings, they would tell you very directly that they were afraid to change a lightbulb because every time they would move the chandelier, every time they'd move one of the ceiling tiles, a gun would be pointed at their face because that's where the drug dealers would hide their substance. They'd watch them through the peepholes.

So for those of you who don't think that it's a problem, I must tell you that it is and that we need to deal with it. The Landlord and Tenant Act is good for a lot of people. But when you're talking about drug dealers, the Landlord and Tenant Act does not go far enough, in my opinion. We need to send a very loud message. Call me

right-wing, call me whatever you want, with this debate. I must tell you that we have to agree to disagree on this one, because I know that there's a problem. We need to send that message.

Again, I'm in support of it. But please, over there, across the floor, don't think that we're supporting it for the same reasons. I think that you're supporting this because you're hungry. You want to eat people. You want to be able to mulch them up and spit them out. I'm supporting it because I really think that the main objective here is to deal with the problem as efficiently and expeditiously as possible.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I'm very concerned it would happen in this committee—and I just noticed they spelled St Catharines incorrectly in a government publication here; it's something those of us from St Catharines always object to—that the government members would in fact be voting down this bill. The committee report is disappointing, because I thought we were getting to a position where there was a consensus being reached on many issues.

The member for Leeds-Grenville has certainly been a long-time advocate of very tough legislation in the field of justice, and there are many of us, I think in all parties, who are very concerned when we see some of the lawbreaking activities that are taking place. I thought the effort that he put forward in this bill to ensure that we would have a regime where we could deal with drug dealers in an appropriate fashion was a good initiative.

One of the problems we notice from the news media, and some members have seen it perhaps on a more firsthand basis, is the problem encountered by people who are struggling within a large housing complex, for instance, to keep the drug dealers out. If anybody thinks they're welcome people, they're not. I think of people, particularly perhaps single-parent families in many cases, where there's a real effort being made by whichever parent it is to look after the children, to keep the children sheltered from those who are breaking the law. The initiative on the part of the member for Leeds-Grenville was in fact designed to tackle that problem, particularly within rental units where there is access in terms of the Landlord and Tenant Act and landlord-tenant issues.

I know the government members are concerned about this as well. I'm not a person who believes that all of the concern rests on this side of the House. So I was surprised that the government members would not agree to this legislation. They would not allow for the bill to proceed, at least for further debate and consideration in this House.

The issue is a genuine issue. The issue is one that is affecting not only the young people but family units as well as young people and older people become addicted to drugs. We can see the damage that is done to the individual in our society when drugs are provided to these people. We can see a life which could be a positive life, a constructive life, being turned in the wrong direction because these people are introduced to drugs.

We know that many people in these developments, the overwhelming majority in housing developments, don't want the drug dealers around. They think it's a bad atmosphere, it gives a bad name to the complex, and it is

illegal activity taking place, and those who are affected by the drugs are often carrying out crimes which are of a violent nature or that are taking property from those who don't have very much in the first place and are struggling to make ends meet.

That is why I'm concerned when I hear the report that the government members, it appears—I can't verify this—on a partisan basis, because the legislation happened to be initiated by a member of the opposition, were prepared to vote against it. As we know, when the government members are told by the whip to vote against something, that legislation is as good as dead, because the government has a majority on virtually all the committees. So it must be disconcerting to people in this House, because we hear all three party leaders and representatives of the three parties say that we would like to see a circumstance in this House where the partisan background of a person presenting a piece of legislation or a resolution doesn't matter so much, but rather the content of that resolution or that bill.

There may be times when I am in disagreement with the member for Leeds-Grenville. We've both been in the House a long period of time. We've agreed on many occasions; we've disagreed on some occasions. But I'm not about to endorse a situation where people would vote against his bill because he happens to be a member of another political party. I don't think that speaks to what people who are watching today and who read Hansard, the many thousands who read Hansard—I don't think that's a situation that they're looking forward to. They're looking for consensus-building. They're looking for people from various political parties to work together on an issue.

So I express genuine concern that the government would vote against this bill. It may not be a perfect piece of legislation. Some members on the government side have pointed out that there may be some deficiencies in it, but surely those can be corrected, surely the bill can be amended, surely the attitudes can be modified and this legislation would then be acceptable to all members of the House. But if it's simply a matter of trying to get credit for something, I think we delay unnecessarily when we could have had the bill proceed.

1650

I was not a member of this particular committee, so I don't believe it's my right to speak at great length on this issue and I don't intend to, but I did want to get on record my concern that we had an opportunity to deal with drug dealers in the rental housing situation and that is not going to happen as a result of the government members on the committee voting against this legislation. I hope they'll reconsider and I hope that today this debate will persuade them that they should allow the legislation to proceed, even if it has to be modified to a certain extent.

**Mr Stockwell:** I would wholeheartedly endorse many of the comments with respect to this piece of legislation. Obviously, the number one concern was outlined by not only the members for Leeds and Burlington South and St Catharines but also the member for Bruce. It is respect for the process that's involved.

It seems to me that a majority of members of this Legislature referred a piece of legislation off to a committee to examine and hear public depositions upon it. That committee, I believe, has a responsibility to report out on any bill. Reporting out means giving the majority of the people in this Legislature an opportunity to weigh the comments that were made and weigh the recommendations of a specific committee report.

Having the six members, as the member for Bruce suggested, unilaterally taking that right away from a majority of legislators, who in fact requested this bill be put to committee, in my opinion certainly circumvents, if not usurps, the democratic process we were entrusted to uphold.

I don't know how those six members, and I look across the floor and I see some of them, think or understand or feel that they can make a decision separate, distinct and different from what a majority of members of this Legislature asked them to do. That's the first point. I don't know how that serves the democratic process and I'm not quite certain of the rationale they would use when defending that process.

If you listen to the member for London South, who I think is absolutely dead wrong on this issue, but that's beside the point, not once did he enter into the real substance of the debate. Why was it killed at committee of six? Because he thought that was worthy of this legislation when a majority of the members opposite thought it was an important piece of legislation.

The other particularly galling point that I think was brought up, and I wish the member for London South were here—

**Hon Mr Charlton:** He is here.

**Mr Stockwell:** Oh, I'm sorry; that he is. He was not in his seat. The other particularly galling point that the member for London South seems to offer up on a regular basis is snippets of information. He offers snippets of what a deponent or a witness will say when appearing before a committee. Once again, in what I find to be typical NDP fashion, they take snippets of information thoroughly and totally out of context and build a house of cards out of it. When you go and examine what they've said they're building this foundation on, the foundation is seriously flawed and very, very short on documentation and evidence that was offered up by the witnesses.

I have no time for this kind of public process or usurping of the democratic process, no time whatsoever. I have no time for drug dealers; I have no time for this issue. They're everywhere in Metropolitan Toronto and certainly probably outside of Metropolitan Toronto. To make the comment that the member for London South suggested, that the vast majority of people appearing before him unanimously, in some cases—he said “unanimously.” People appeared before him to tell us that this piece of legislation was flawed and in fact supported the government knocking it down and in some instances said there wasn't a problem.

I say to the member for London South, if you don't think there is a problem, you are so out of touch it's



incredible. You're absolutely, categorically and thoroughly out of touch with what's going on in the real world. If you could tell me in London South that you don't have a drug problem, that you don't have a drug problem in MTHA housing projects, then I say to you, Mr Speaker, what we need is to educate this member for London South, not in the pristine walls of this House or in the committee rooms we meet in; we must educate him in those housing projects, in Jane and Finch, in Willowridge, in Scarborough and in these outposts right across this province of Ontario.

Drug dealers and drugs are taking over entire neighbourhoods. People are frightened to come out of their homes for fear of being shot, killed. They don't allow their children out for fear that these kids won't be safe. Entire, complete neighbourhoods are under seige. What we need to do to educate the obviously uninformed member for London South, who attributed remarks earlier, what we need to do to educate members such as him, is to get them out on to those streets to see what kind of awful conditions people are asked to live in because of drug dealers.

If the comments from Hansard were brought out and distributed to the people in MTHA housing projects—not just MTHA but in housing projects, period, that are overrun with drug dealers; not just apartment buildings but neighbourhoods, houses, where they've shut down streets from fear; drug dealers have shut down entire streets—if they were to hear this kind of socialist pap, the absolute garbage that came out of this member's mouth in the committee about double jeopardy, that it somehow put these people into double jeopardy when they lose their apartments, it wouldn't take a minute of time before he would be absolutely accosted from all angles by the people he purports to represent, along with his government, suggesting in here, "Once they serve their sentence, once they're ready to re-enter society, why should they not have a residence to go back to?" This is aside from all the other concerns about them moving on to other residences and plying their trade elsewhere if that's their inclination.

That's the kind of stuff at committee you've got to listen to from a member who is so completely out of touch he actually believed the Parkdale legal aid clinic, which is nothing but a front; the fact is it's a front for the NDP, nothing but a front. They came in and had the gall to suggest there was no drug problem in Parkdale. How can we, in good conscience, who travel back and forth going through Parkdale on a daily basis, even begin to lend credibility to the kind of comment, "There is no drug problem in Parkdale"? This person is clearly and absolutely so wrong, it's incredible how wrong they could be, that there is no drug problem in Parkdale.

Another shill who came in representing the NDP, and the member from Leeds may remind me about the person who came in representing another grass-roots group, suggested—get this; this is what they suggested—that rather than trying to evict the drug dealer from his residence and terrifying floors and floors in apartments and neighbourhoods, what the community should do—get this; this is actually representative of the people whom

this member heard from, who he thinks are representative of the community—this person who came before us as a witness suggested that the community should get together and have a meeting with the drug dealer to talk him out of dealing any more drugs.

**Mr Runciman:** That's the same guy.

**Mr Stockwell:** That's this Parkdale legal aid clinic; the same guy who said there wasn't a problem. He said the best way to solve it isn't with law enforcement, isn't with cleaning out the drug dealers and the nests that are all over this community; we are supposed to expect the community to organize a group to go and meet with the dealer and tell him why he should close up shop and not deal any more drugs. This is the stuff the member for London South puts his faith in when he gets asinine, hare-brained attempts at logic and leaps of faith that come out of the Parkdale legal aid clinic. That's just a joke, that anyone could sit there and listen to that garbage and then bring it forward in this House as if it were some kind of legitimate person coming forward and offering concrete, reasoned argument against this kind of legislation.

1700

The other point I want to make very clear is that he took time at great length to quote—I have his name here; I'm sorry, it's a difficult name—Mr Kuszelewski with respect to representing the property management companies and the fact that they are opposed to the legislation brought forward by the member from Leeds.

What the member for London South did not do, which is typical of the member for London South, is provide all the concrete data offered by this person in terms of what he thought of the legislation. This is what I'll do for you. He suggested that this was a bad bill and should not be passed? That can't be any further from the truth. Again, he takes a snippet of information and builds a paper house and tells us that property managers and property management companies are opposed to this piece of legislation. You can't use the word "misleading," so I won't, but that is just fundamentally without basis in fact.

He said: "Having an opportunity to review Bill 20, I can indicate to this committee that it is of prime importance respecting the protection of victims of drug offences and offences related thereto. There is little enough legislation in this province to defend the safety of innocent persons from this type of plague."

He's suggesting to you, I say to the member for London South—and I don't have to tell you, because you know this. You simply chose to have selective amnesia and not quote this kind of stuff.

I'll read on: "As someone continuously involved in the judicial procedures now available regarding residential tenancy law, I would be remiss if I did not include herein some suggestions to expand upon and improve those current procedures through Bill 20."

The bottom line is that he says that maybe it's not a perfect piece of legislation, but he offered changes that would make it better, and that this is the kind of legislation we need to help those people in their fight against the cockroaches who are the drug dealers in our commun-

ity and get rid of them, out of the buildings and out of the communities they're infecting. In my opinion, the member for London South was totally unwarranted and unfair, the way he took the positions put forward by this witness and twisted them, in his typical socialist ideology, to build a paper house that doesn't have a foundation worthy of debating.

In conclusion, he said, "Without Bill 20, the ability of landlords to successfully curtail the criminal element in residential settings is in some circumstances limited."

It's shameful, first of all, that six members of the government would take something that a majority of the members of this Legislature asked them to review and kill a piece of legislation without giving us the opportunity to vote on it, when we simply asked you as a committee to deal with the deputations involved. Finally, to warp and provide misinformation with respect to the deputations you heard is equally disgraceful.

The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority is the largest housing authority in this province, and they came in and told you these problems exist and that this kind of legislation is a step in the right direction. To offer up anything less than real concern among tenants, real concern among landlords and real concern among police officers who are trying to patrol these problems is despicable, in my opinion—typical but despicable.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I just wanted to add a couple of concerns from the perspective of a community that is not necessarily within Metro Toronto, although I understand the comments made by the previous speaker and the concern around the MTHA. We as well, of course, have numerous areas in our community that cause some concerns with regard to this issue.

But what I find most interesting, not having been on the committee, is to see the result of committee hearings spilling out on the floor of this place, which clearly shows me that the predetermination of the government members on that committee was likely made before any of the deputations or witnesses came before the committee. That's unfortunate.

This takes me back. Some members will know I've suggested for some time in the past that we take a look at changing the process at committee and doing what I refer to as inverse legislation, which would mean that a private member or a government member could introduce a piece of legislation into a committee and it could actually be taken seriously at the committee. Government members, if it were an opposition piece of legislation, could put forward amendments. They could get, without having the situation driven by the party whip, of any of the three parties—you could actually have an open and honest dialogue.

It seems to me that this particular bill, put forward in a spirit of getting tough with drug dealers in the province, not just in the city of Toronto—because as I and others have said on numerous occasions, this is not the province of Toronto; this is the province of Ontario. There are problems with our young people being lured into drugs everywhere in this province. I don't care where you go. You don't have to deal only in Toronto or in Mississauga

or in Richmond Hill or in London. Go into northern Ontario and take a look at the problems we find in isolation, where there are kids who are being dragged into drugs, into abuse. This bill, it seemed to me, was put forward in a spirit of zero tolerance for drug dealers anywhere in the province, and what better way to use the law than to give people the authority to reject having drug dealers living in their community? We're simply going to turf them out.

The thing we tend to forget is that sometimes the message is more important than the actual bill or legislation. I find it passing strange that we would all endorse a policy of zero tolerance around violence in our schools, that if we have a young person in our school who's caught with a weapon, that's it, they're gone, they're out—I've heard members of the NDP caucus, and the recent by-election was probably a good opportunity to test some of the policies, saying they support the Scarborough Board of Education's policy of zero tolerance. I've heard some debate on that. I've certainly heard the Tories and our caucus saying similar things, although we've expressed concerns about what happens to the young people when you simply transfer them from one school board and send them out—you can't put them in another one. They wind up at home. They wind up breaking into our houses.

Here we have a situation where there appears to be, on a broad-based level, support for zero tolerance against violence in our schools, yet we wind up on the first day returning in this place debating what in essence is a policy of zero tolerance against drug pushers in our communities, and we have a government-dominated committee rejecting that? I'm astounded at that. I had hoped we were going to get into the debate on the credit union issue legislation, Bill 134 that's put forward today.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** So was I.

**Mr Mahoney:** I'm sure you were. It's astounding, I say to the House leader opposite, who must be aware of what goes on in committee, to find that the six government members of this committee would simply leave this bill to float for ever and never come into this place, because that's in essence what they do when they don't report it. They didn't vote against it. They just kill it. They use the process that is available to them in this place to kill the legislation.

I heard the member for London South try to portray the fact that the Landlord and Tenant Act that exists in this province has more teeth than the justice system. Ask landlords what they can do to evict a tenant in the province of Ontario. Ask any of them. With the stalling and the games that can go on, that tenant could be there for ever. So don't try to kid us that under the Landlord and Tenant Act, if a landlord determines that a drug pusher lives in their community, all they have to do is issue them an eviction notice and boom, they're out of there. We know that's not true. We know from history that's simply not true.

1710

There may be some legitimate reasons in the past, and there have been, to provide protection for tenants. Indeed, our government was part of many proposals that would



do that, but we're talking about drug pushers here. Even if the legislation as proposed by the member from the Conservative caucus wasn't 100% enforceable, my point is, it's the message you send out there that is the important thing.

Last week or the week before, I was in Sault Ste Marie and I was invited to a meeting—

**Mr Elston:** Your home town.

**Mr Mahoney:** My home town, where I was born, thank you very much. I have many relatives all over this province but we won't go through that.

But I was invited to a meeting at the Ontario Lottery Corp because there have been a lot of complaints recently about the fact that Bill 92—which members will remember was the private member's bill that made it illegal to sell lottery tickets to kids under the age of 18. The concern has been expressed that the bill is not being enforced and kids are still buying those tickets and playing Pro Line gambling. I know that's true.

Does that mean we should not have passed that bill? Does that mean that we should not have sent a message out to the young people and to the retailers and to the lottery corporation? Does that mean that it's okay for young people to gamble on professional sports in our corner stores? Does that mean it's okay to turn our corner stores into bookie joints? None of that is acceptable just because it's hard to enforce. Because it's hard to enforce the selling of tobacco products to our young people, does that mean that we shouldn't have a law that says it's illegal to do that? I would certainly hope not.

I think in this place we have to pass legislation that sends a message out there, that sets a standard out there. The standard is that it's not acceptable in our society to have our kids spending their lunch money gambling, that it's not acceptable out there to see our kids buying cigarettes and smoking cigarettes and I think clearly a message that would be equally if not more appropriate is that it's not acceptable for drug pushers to infect our young people with their particular way of life. If this bill just had one little chance of sending a message out there that says we are going to have zero tolerance for drug pushers, whether it's in our MTHA properties, whether it's in our Peel Non-Profit Housing properties, whether it's anywhere in our community, we are going to seek ways to destroy drug pushers from continuing to operate in our society.

I just don't understand any kind of logic other than the mindless partisanship that has been shown by the six members and to have them actually stand up in this place and try to defend that nonsense is really quite remarkable. It's particularly remarkable to see an NDP try to defend that because we have seen the sanctimonious debates over the years where these same people have tried to pretend that they are the defenders of the little guy, that they are the only ones who believe in family morals, that they are the only ones who care about work for our youth and our young people, that they are the only ones who care about reforming our education system, and we've simply seen that is not the case. It appears the emperor has no clothes and this government has no moral leadership when it can ignore a legitimate concern.

If you didn't agree with the way that the member from Leeds-Grenville was putting forth his case, why wouldn't you make an amendment or two? Why wouldn't you sit down with the member and say: "We think you're going to an extreme here and it won't work. We think that the courts will declare it unconstitutional and it won't work. We agree with the principle that's stated in the bill that we have zero tolerance against drug pushers selling drugs to our young people in our housing developments in this province right across the province"?

I'm sure there are serious problems in Windsor, in Ottawa, in Sault Ste Marie, in Thunder Bay. I'm sure it exists everywhere. Just talk to some of the young people. We see the young person who comes out today. It's interesting: I was at a luncheon for the YMCA in the past couple of weeks and the guest speaker was Ken Dryden, former commissioner for young people in this province and a well-known—

**Mr Stockwell:** He's running for you, isn't he?

**Mr Mahoney:** That's right. He may well run for us at some point. We would welcome him with open arms.

**Mr Stockwell:** He's running for us too.

**Mr Mahoney:** You'd like him to run for you, but I can tell you that he's probably not going to do that.

In any event, his point, which was quite interesting, was that when you go and visit the schools, you see these young people in the schools and at first blush you meet them and they've got—he talked about one fellow who is in science who had metal parts protruding from various parts of his body; rather odd, rather strange. To look at this young person you would think you've got a very strange individual on your hands. He then got to talk to this young person, talked to the teachers and found out that they had a science major inside this unusual clothing and way of portraying himself.

My point is that we have a lot of tremendous talent within our schools and within our youth communities. Too often we hear about the young offenders. Too often we hear about the mass murders and the problems and the drugs and everything else, when the fact is—having three young people of my own I'm attempting to help kickstart their lives—I believe the vast majority of our young people are honest, decent, hardworking, caring, moral. They have higher moral standards today, in many cases, than we had when we were their age.

I suggest that we have an obligation to set standards for those young people, to say to them, "We're going to give you a chance in life even though we know we can't give you a job right now," even though we would encourage our young people to stay in school as long as possible because there simply isn't work out there for them, and they're better off to focus on some training and on improving their chances whenever we can get an opportunity to get this economy rolling again, which may begin in about, I'm guessing 12 months or maybe less when Mr Rae and Mr Mills and others decide that they're prepared to go back to the people and talk to the people about their vision of how they—and do you know what? When we go back to the people, I hope that this issue becomes a real issue right in the schools and in the

communities. I hope that anybody who runs is prepared to stand up and say, "I not only believe in zero tolerance for violence, but I believe in zero tolerance for one of the root causes of violence in this province, and that's drug abuse."

Drug abuse is something, I can tell you, that when you see the problems that people have today in getting jobs, you see single mothers worried, they send their kids out every day, you go into some of the complexes—I had a situation a couple of years ago in a community known as Roche Court in Mississauga where the tenants came to me and said: "We have a real problem. We've got a lot of violence and we've got drug pushers in our community. What can we do about it?"

We developed a plan where we, through city council's efforts, decided to take back the community, away from the criminals who were the dominating lifestyle in Roche Court. We convened public meetings. We got people involved. We had Saturday morning cleanups. We had activity days that we organized in this complex. We changed, for at least a short time, the attitude and we actually turned it around where the drug pushers and the criminals were afraid to stick their noses out in the community instead of the decent folk afraid to go out at night or even in the daytime. So it can be done.

There are other examples in my own community and in my own city where we've gone out and collectively, through working with the community, taken back the streets and made it safe for women and for children and for everybody to enjoy themselves in that community. So much of it is attitude. So much of it is the message that you want to send out.

In closing, let me just say I think we have to reinforce the attitude that as legislators, as leaders in our community we are not going to tolerate this kind of thing. It could be so simple if a legislative committee would simply put its partisan hat aside and stop the bickering and stop the hate that seems to manifest itself in some of these debates and take a look at the real issue: Do we care about drug pushers being in our communities?

Do we think this will get rid of them? No, it won't. There's absolutely no doubt that this particular private member's bill will not eliminate drug pushers either in MTHA housing units or in any housing unit or community, but it is one small step where we could all unite, as we did on Bill 52 with our kids' gambling. We united in this place and in six days we passed a private member's bill that said: "We're not going to allow that. We're going to send a message that says gambling by our young people is not acceptable."

Why could we not do the same thing when it comes to drug pushers anywhere in this province? I think it's most unfortunate. It is indicative, however, of the attitude that permeates the government backbenchers when they go into committees with these particular pieces of legislation. Instead of looking at what is good and positive and wholesome to revitalize the family unit in our communities, they look at what is partisan from their point of view and they make their decisions on that basis.

They should be ashamed of themselves for not reporting this bill into the House for good, wholesome debate

and for amendments to be put forward so that we could indeed tell our young people that we care about their future and we are not going to tolerate drug pushers in our communities for one second.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Further debate? Shall the report be received and adopted?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it. Call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1722 to 1752.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Would the members please take their seats.

Mr Marchese has moved the adoption of the report of the standing committee on administration of justice with regard to Bill 20. All those in favour of the motion, please rise one at a time.

**Ayes**

Abel, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Churley, Cooper, Coppen, Duignan, Farnan, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), Klopp, Kormos, Laughren, Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip (Etobicoke-Rexdale), Sutherland, Swarbrick, Ward, Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Winniger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

**The Acting Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time.

**Nays**

Arnott, Bradley, Brown, Caplan, Carr, Chiarelli, Conway, Crozier, Cunningham, Eddy, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Harnick, Harris, Johnson (Don Mills), Jordan, Mahoney, Miclash, Offer, O'Neil (Quinte), O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau), Poirier, Runciman, Ruprecht, Sterling, Stockwell, Turnbull, Wilson (Simcoe West).

**The Acting Speaker:** The ayes being 53 and the nays being 29, I declare this motion carried.

**Mr Runciman:** Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege of all members of the House and of the province of Ontario: We were talking about the new member who recently won the by-election in Victoria-Haliburton and the member for Scarborough Centre, the chair of the NDP caucus, asked where the new member was and had he packed his white robes yet. I think that's the sort of remark that has to be drawn to the attention of the Chair, because it's the sort of remark that is insulting not only to members of this House, not only to members of this party, but to people right across this province. That sort of attitude from the chair of the NDP caucus—

**The Acting Speaker:** Would the member take his seat, please.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. Would the members take their seats, please.



**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT, 1994****LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LES RELATIONS DE TRAVAIL**

On motion by Mr Mahoney, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 141, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act /  
Projet de loi 141, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations de  
travail.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):**  
Would the member have any statement with regard to this  
bill?

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** This  
is private member's legislation that was referred to earlier

today in question period in asking the Premier to adopt this legislation, which would amend Bill 40, the labour relations amendment act. It would allow private rail operators in the Barrie-Collingwood area, but indeed anywhere in the province, to be able to acquire the spur lines that are being closed by CN, or by CP for that matter, and would deal with successorship rights, which is section 64 under the labour relations act, Bill 40. It would allow these people to save jobs in that community and keep the spur line in operation.

**The Acting Speaker:** It being now 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 1:30.

The House adjourned at 1800.

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO  
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

**Lieutenant Governor/Lieutenant-gouverneur: Lt Col The Hon/L'hon Henry N.R. Jackman CM, KStJ, BA, LLB, LLD**

**Speaker/Président: Hon/L'hon David Warner**

**Clerk/Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers**

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals/Greffier adjoint principal et Greffier des journaux: Alex D. McFedries**

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees/Greffière adjointe et Greffière des comités: Deborah Deller**

**Sergeant at Arms/Sergent d'armes: Thomas Stelling**

| <b>Member/Député(e)</b>                    | <b>Constituency/Circonscription</b> | <b>Party/Parti</b> | <b>Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités</b>   |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Abel, Donald                               | Wentworth North/-Nord               | ND                 | deputy government whip / whip adjoint du gouvernement  |
| Akande, Zanana                             | St Andrew-St Patrick                | ND                 | parliamentary assistant to the Premier /<br>adjointe parlementaire du premier ministre   |
| <b>Allen, Hon/L'hon<br/>Richard</b>        | Hamilton West/-Ouest                | ND                 | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Economic Development<br>and Trade / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère<br>du Développement économique et du Commerce  |
| Arnott, Ted                                | Wellington                          | PC                 | Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates /<br>Vice-Président du Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses   |
| Beer, Charles                              | York-Mackenzie                      | L                  | Chair, standing committee on social development /<br>Président du Comité permanent des affaires sociales   |
| Bisson, Gilles                             | Cochrane South/-Sud                 | ND                 | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Northern Development and<br>Mines, parliamentary assistant to minister responsible for<br>francophone affairs / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre<br>du Développement du Nord et des Mines, adjoint parlementaire<br>du ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones |
| <b>Boyd, Hon/L'hon<br/>Marion</b>          | London Centre/-Centre               | ND                 | Attorney General, minister responsible for women's issues /<br>procureure générale, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine  |
| Bradley, James J.                          | St Catharines                       | L                  | opposition deputy House leader /<br>chef parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition   |
| Brown, Michael A.                          | Algoma-Manitoulin                   | L                  | Chair, standing committee on general government /<br>Président du Comité permanent des affaires gouvernementales   |
| <b>Buchanan, Hon/L'hon<br/>Elmer</b>       | Hastings-Peterborough               | ND                 | Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre<br>de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales  |
| Callahan, Robert V.                        | Brampton South/-Sud                 | L                  |  |
| Caplan, Elinor                             | Oriole                              | L                  |  |
| Carr, Gary                                 | Oakville South/-Sud                 | PC                 | Progressive Conservative deputy House leader /<br>chef parlementaire adjoint du Parti progressiste-conservateur  |
| Carter, Jenny                              | Peterborough                        | ND                 | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Citizenship /<br>adjointe parlementaire de la ministre des Affaires civiques  |
| <b>Charlton, Hon/L'hon<br/>Brian</b>       | Hamilton Mountain                   | ND                 | Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House<br>leader and minister responsible for the automobile insurance<br>review / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire<br>du gouvernement et délégué à l'Assurance-automobile  |
| Chiarelli, Robert                          | Ottawa West/-Ouest                  | L                  |  |
| <b>Christopherson,<br/>Hon/L'hon David</b> | Hamilton Centre/-Centre             | ND                 | Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services /<br>solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels   |
| <b>Churley, Hon/L'hon<br/>Marilyn</b>      | Riverdale                           | ND                 | Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations /<br>ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce  |
| Cleary, John C.                            | Cornwall                            | L                  |  |
| Conway, Sean G.                            | Renfrew North/-Nord                 | L                  | Deputy Leader of the Opposition /<br>chef adjoint de l'opposition  |
| <b>Cooke, Hon/L'hon<br/>David</b>          | Windsor-Riverside                   | ND                 | Minister of Education and Training, minister responsible for the<br>Ontario Training and Adjustment Board / ministre de l'Éducation<br>et de la Formation, ministre responsable du Conseil ontarien<br>de formation et d'adaptation de la main-d'oeuvre  |



| Member/Député(e)                  | Constituency/Circonscription | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités   |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Cooper, Mike                      | Kitchener-Wilmot             | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Labour; Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development / adjoint parlementaire du ministre du Travail, Vice-Président du Comité permanent du développement des ressources   |
| <b>Coppen, Hon/L'hon Shirley</b>  | Niagara South/-Sud           | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs   |
| Cordiano, Joseph                  | Lawrence                     | L           | Chair, standing committee on public accounts / Président du Comité permanent des comptes publics  |
| Cousens, W. Donald                | Markham                      | PC          |   |
| Crozier, Bruce                    | Essex South/-Sud             | L           |   |
| Cunningham, Dianne                | London North/-Nord           | PC          |   |
| Curling, Alvin                    | Scarborough North/-Nord      | L           | opposition deputy whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition   |
| Dadamo, George                    | Windsor-Sandwich             | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Transportation / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Transports  |
| Daigeler, Hans                    | Nepean                       | L           | Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government / Vice-Président du Comité permanent des affaires gouvernementales   |
| Duignan, Noel                     | Halton North/-Nord           | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce   |
| Eddy, Ron                         | Brant-Haldimand              | L           | Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development / Vice-Président du Comité permanent des affaires sociales   |
| Elston, Murray J.                 | Bruce                        | L           | opposition House leader / chef parlementaire de l'opposition  |
| Eves, Ernie                       | Parry Sound                  | PC          | Progressive Conservative House leader / chef parlementaire du Parti progressiste-conservateur   |
| <b>Farnan, Hon/L'hon Mike</b>     | Cambridge                    | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Education and Training / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de l'Éducation et de la Formation  |
| Fawcett, Joan M.                  | Northumberland               | L           |   |
| Ferguson, Will                    | Kitchener                    | Ind         |   |
| Fletcher, Derek                   | Guelph                       | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Citizenship / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre des Affaires civiques   |
| Frankford, Robert                 | Scarborough East/-Est        | ND          |   |
| <b>Gigantes, Hon/L'hon Evelyn</b> | Ottawa Centre/-Centre        | ND          | Minister of Housing / ministre du Logement  |
| Grandmaître, Bernard C.           | Ottawa East/-Est             | L           |   |
| <b>Grier, Hon/L'hon Ruth A.</b>   | Etobicoke-Lakeshore          | ND          | Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé   |
| Haeck, Christel                   | St Catharines-Brock          | ND          | government whip; Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills / whip du gouvernement, Présidente du Comité permanent des règlements et des projets de loi privés  |
| <b>Hampton, Hon/L'hon Howard</b>  | Rainy River                  | ND          | Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles   |
| Hansen, Ron                       | Lincoln                      | ND          | Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly / Président du Comité permanent de l'Assemblée législative  |
| Harnick, Charles                  | Willowdale                   | PC          |   |
| Harrington, Margaret H.           | Niagara Falls                | ND          | First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House; Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice / Premier Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative, Vice-Présidente du Comité permanent de l'administration de la justice |
| Harris, Michael                   | Nipissing                    | PC          | leader of the Progressive Conservative Party / chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur  |
| Haslam, Karen                     | Perth                        | ND          |   |

| Member/Député(e)                     | Constituency/Circonscription   | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités  |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| Hayes, Pat                           | Essex-Kent   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Municipal Affairs /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Affaires municipales   |
| Henderson, D. James                  | Etobicoke-Humber   | L           |  |
| Hope, Randy R.                       | Chatham-Kent   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Community and Social<br>Services / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Services sociaux<br>et communautaires  |
| Huget, Bob                           | Sarnia   | ND          | government whip; parliamentary assistant to Minister of<br>Environment and Energy; Chair, standing committee on<br>resources development / whip du gouvernement; adjoint<br>parlementaire du ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie,<br>Président du Comité permanent du développement des ressources   |
| Jackson, Cameron                     | Burlington South/-Sud  | PC          | Chair, standing committee on estimates /<br>Président du Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses   |
| Jamison, Norm                        | Norfolk  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Economic Development<br>and Trade / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre du<br>Développement économique et du Commerce  |
| Johnson, David                       | Don Mills  | PC          |  |
| Johnson, Paul R.                     | Prince Edward-<br>Lennox-South Hastings /<br>Prince Edward-Lennox-<br>Hastings-Sud | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Economic Development<br>and Trade; Chair, standing committee on finance and economic<br>affairs / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre du Développement<br>économique et du Commerce, Président du Comité permanent<br>des finances et des affaires économiques   |
| Jordan, W. Leo                       | Lanark-Renfrew   | PC          |  |
| Klopp, Paul                          | Huron  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Agriculture, Food and<br>Rural Affairs / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Agriculture,<br>de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales   |
| Kormos, Peter                        | Welland-Thorold  | ND          |  |
| Kwinter, Monte                       | Wilson Heights   | L           |  |
| <b>Lankin, Hon/L'hon<br/>Frances</b> | Beaches-Woodbine   | ND          | Minister of Economic Development and Trade /<br>ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce  |
| <b>Laughren, Hon/L'hon<br/>Floyd</b> | Nickel Belt  | ND          | Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance /<br>vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances  |
| Lessard, Wayne                       | Windsor-Walkerville  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Environment and Energy /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Environnement et<br>de l'Énergie   |
| <b>Mackenzie, Hon/L'hon<br/>Bob</b>  | Hamilton East/-Est   | ND          | Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail   |
| MacKinnon, Ellen                     | Lambton  | ND          | Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills /<br>Vice-Présidente du Comité permanent des règlements et<br>des projets de loi privés  |
| Mahoney, Steven W.                   | Mississauga West/-Ouest  | L           | opposition chief whip / whip en chef de l'opposition   |
| Malkowski, Gary                      | York East/-Est   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education and Training /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Éducation et<br>de la Formation  |
| Mammoliti, George                    | Yorkview   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Solicitor General and Minister of<br>Correctional Services / adjoint parlementaire du solliciteur<br>général et ministre des Services correctionnels  |
| Marchese, Rosario                    | Fort York  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to the Premier; parliamentary assistant to<br>Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs; Chair, standing committee<br>on administration of justice / adjoint parlementaire du premier<br>ministre, adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Affaires<br>intergouvernementales, Président du Comité permanent<br>de l'administration de la justice |
| Marland, Margaret                    | Mississauga South/-Sud   | PC          | Chair, standing committee on government agencies /<br>Présidente du Comité permanent des organismes<br>gouvernementaux   |
| <b>Martel, Hon/L'hon<br/>Shelley</b> | Sudbury East/-Est  | ND          | Minister of Northern Development and Mines /<br>ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines   |



| Member/Député(e)                     | Constituency/Circonscription                  | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités   |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|
| Martin, Tony                         | Sault Ste Marie /<br>Sault-Sainte-Marie       | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education and Training /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Éducation et<br>de la Formation   |
| Mathysen, Irene                      | Middlesex                                     | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Environment and Energy /<br>adjointe parlementaire du ministre de l'Environnement et<br>de l'Énergie   |
| McClelland, Carman                   | Brampton North/-Nord                          | L           |   |
| McGuinty, Dalton J.P.                | Ottawa South/-Sud                             | L           |   |
| McLean, Allan K.                     | Simcoe East/-Est                              | PC          | Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies /<br>Vice-Président du Comité permanent des organismes<br>gouvernementaux   |
| McLeod, Lyn                          | Fort William                                  | L           | Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition   |
| Miclash, Frank                       | Kenora  | L           | opposition deputy whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition   |
| Mills, Gord                          | Durham East/-Est                              | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Solicitor General and Minister of<br>Correctional Services / adjoint parlementaire du solliciteur<br>général et ministre des Services correctionnels                         |
| Morin, Gilles E.                     | Carleton East/-Est                            | L           | Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole<br>House / Vice-Président de la Chambre et Président du Comité<br>plénier de l'Assemblée législative   |
| Morrow, Mark                         | Wentworth East/-Est                           | ND          |   |
| Murdoch, Bill                        | Grey-Owen Sound                               | PC          |   |
| Murdock, Sharon                      | Sudbury                                       | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Labour /<br>adjointe parlementaire du ministre du Travail  |
| Murphy, Tim                          | St George-St David                            | L           |   |
| North, Peter                         | Elgin   | Ind         |   |
| O'Connor, Larry                      | Durham-York                                   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Health /<br>adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Santé   |
| O'Neil, Hugh P.                      | Quinte  | L           |   |
| O'Neill, Yvonne                      | Ottawa-Rideau                                 | L           |   |
| Offer, Steven                        | Mississauga North/-Nord                       | L           |   |
| Owens, Stephen                       | Scarborough Centre/-Centre                    | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Finance /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Finances  |
| Perruzza, Anthony                    | Downsview                                     | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Chair of the Management Board of<br>Cabinet / adjoint parlementaire du président du Conseil<br>de gestion  |
| <b>Philip, Hon/L'hon Ed</b>          | Etobicoke-Rexdale                             | ND          | Minister of Municipal Affairs, minister responsible for the office<br>for the greater Toronto area / ministre des Affaires municipales,<br>ministre responsable du Bureau de la région du grand Toronto |
| Phillips, Gerry                      | Scarborough-Agincourt                         | L           |   |
| <b>Pilkey, Hon/L'hon Allan</b>       | Oshawa  | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Municipal Affairs /<br>ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Affaires municipales   |
| Poirier, Jean                        | Prescott and Russell /<br>Prescott et Russell | L           |   |
| Poole, Dianne                        | Eglinton                                      | L           | Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts /<br>Vice-Présidente du Comité permanent des comptes publics  |
| <b>Pouliot, Hon/L'hon<br/>Gilles</b> | Lake Nipigon / Lac-Nipigon                    | ND          | Minister of Transportation, minister responsible for francophone<br>affairs / ministre des Transports, ministre délégué aux Affaires<br>francophones  |
| <b>Rae, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>            | York South/-Sud                               | ND          | Premier, President of the Executive Council, Minister of<br>Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre, président<br>du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires gouvernementales                      |
| Ramsay, David                        | Timiskaming                                   | L           |   |
| Rizzo, Tony                          | Oakwood                                       | ND          | government whip; Chair, standing committee on the<br>Ombudsman / whip du gouvernement, Président du Comité<br>permanent de l'ombudsman  |
| Runciman, Robert W.                  | Leeds-Grenville                               | PC          | Progressive Conservative chief whip /<br>whip en chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur  |
| Ruprecht, Tony                       | Parkdale                                      | L           |   |

| Member/Député(e)                      | Constituency/Circonscription                       | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités  |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| <b>Silipo, Hon/L'hon Tony</b>         | Dovercourt   | ND          | Minister of Community and Social Services /<br>ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires   |
| Sola, John                            | Mississauga East/-Est                              | Ind         |  |
| Sorbara, Gregory S.                   | York Centre/-Centre                                | L           |  |
| Sterling, Norman W.                   | Carleton   | PC          |  |
| Stockwell, Chris                      | Etobicoke West/-Ouest                              | PC          |  |
| Sullivan, Barbara                     | Halton Centre/-Centre                              | L           |  |
| Sutherland, Kimble                    | Oxford   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Finance /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Finances   |
| <b>Swarbrick, Hon/L'hon Anne</b>      | Scarborough West/-Ouest                            | ND          | Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation /<br>ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs  |
| Tilson, David                         | Dufferin-Peel                                      | PC          |  |
| Turnbull, David                       | York Mills   | PC          | Progressive Conservative deputy whip /<br>whip adjoint du Parti progressiste-conservateur  |
| Villeneuve, Noble                     | S-D-G & East Grenville<br>S-D-G & Grenville-Est    | PC          | Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House /<br>Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative  |
| <b>Ward, Hon/L'hon Brad</b>           | Brantford  | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Finance /<br>ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Finances  |
| <b>Wark-Martyn, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b> | Port Arthur  | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Health /<br>ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Santé  |
| <b>Warner, Hon/L'hon David</b>        | Scarborough-Ellesmere                              | ND          | Speaker / Président  |
| Waters, Daniel                        | Muskoka-Georgian Bay                               | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs  |
| Wessenger, Paul                       | Simcoe Centre/-Centre                              | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Health; Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Santé, Vice-Président du Comité permanent de l'Assemblée législative  |
| White, Drummond                       | Durham Centre/-Centre                              | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Municipal Affairs / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Affaires municipales  |
| <b>Wildman, Hon/L'hon Bud</b>         | Algoma   | ND          | Minister of Environment and Energy, minister responsible for native affairs / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones   |
| <b>Wilson, Hon/L'hon Fred</b>         | Frontenac-Addington                                | ND          | Minister without Portfolio and chief government whip / ministre sans portefeuille et whip en chef du gouvernement  |
| Wilson, Jim                           | Simcoe West/-Ouest                                 | PC          |  |
| Wilson, Gary                          | Kingston and The Islands /<br>Kingston et Les Îles | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Housing; Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de Logement, Vice-Président du Comité permanent de l'ombudsman  |
| Winninger, David                      | London South/-Sud                                  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General, parliamentary assistant to minister responsible for native affairs / adjoint parlementaire de la procureure générale, adjoint parlementaire du ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones  |
| Wiseman, Jim                          | Durham West/-Ouest                                 | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet; Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs / adjoint parlementaire du président du Conseil de gestion, Vice-Président du Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques                                  |
| Witmer, Elizabeth                     | Waterloo North/-Nord                               | PC          |  |
| Wood, Len                             | Cochrane North/-Nord                               | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Natural Resources / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Richesses naturelles  |
| <b>Ziemba, Hon/L'hon Elaine</b>       | High Park-Swansea                                  | ND          | Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for human rights, disability issues, seniors' issues and race relations / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre déléguée aux Droits de la personne, aux Affaires des personnes handicapées, aux Affaires des personnes âgées et aux Relations interraciales |
| Vacant                                | Victoria-Haliburton                                |             |  |



**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Administration of justice/Administration de la justice**

Chair/Président: Rosario Marchese  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Margaret H. Harrington  
Zanana L. Akande, Robert Chiarelli, Alvin Curling,  
Noel Duignan, Charles Harnick, Gary Malkowski,  
Gordon Mills, Tim Murphy, David Tilson, David Winninger  
Clerk/Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Estimates/Budgets des dépenses**

Chair/Président: Cameron Jackson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ted Arnott  
Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Gary Carr, Murray J. Elston,  
Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Wayne Lessard,  
Steven W. Mahoney, David Ramsay, Jim Wiseman  
Clerk/Greffier: Tonia Grannum

**Finance and economic affairs/**

**Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair/Président: Paul R. Johnson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Jim Wiseman  
Elinor Caplan, Gary Carr, W. Donald Cousens,  
Karen Haslam, Norm Jamison, Monte Kwinter,  
Wayne Lessard, Irene Mathysen, Gerry Phillips,  
Kimble Sutherland  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**General government/Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair/Président: Michael A. Brown  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Hans Daigeler  
Ted Arnott, George Dadamo, Derek Fletcher,  
Bernard C. Grandmaître, David Johnson,  
George Mammoliti, Mark Morrow, Gregory S. Sorbara,  
Paul Wessinger, Drummond White  
Clerk/Greffier: Franco Carrozza

**Government agencies/Organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair/Présidente: Margaret Marland  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Allan K. McLean  
James J. Bradley, Jenny Carter, John C. Cleary,  
Alvin Curling, Robert Frankford, Margaret H. Harrington,  
George Mammoliti, Rosario Marchese, Daniel Waters,  
Elizabeth Witmer  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**Legislative Assembly/Assemblée législative**

Chair/Président: Ron Hansen  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Paul Wessinger  
George Dadamo, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon,  
Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin,  
Norman W. Sterling, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland,  
Noble Villeneuve  
Clerk/Greffière: Lisa Freedman

**Ombudsman**

Chair/Président: Tony Rizzo  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Gary Wilson  
Donald Abel, Zanana L. Akande, Mike Cooper,  
Karen Haslam, James Henderson, Tony Martin,  
Frank Miclash, Bill Murdoch, David Ramsay,  
Chris Stockwell  
Clerk/Greffier: Todd Decker

**Public accounts/Comptes publics**

Chair/Président: Joseph Cordiano  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Dianne Poole  
Gilles Bisson, Robert V. Callahan, Noel Duignan,  
Robert Frankford, Margaret Marland, Tim Murphy,  
Larry O'Connor, Steve Owens, Anthony Perruzza,  
David Tilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Todd Decker

**Regulations and private bills/**

**Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair/Présidente: Christel Haeck  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Ellen MacKinnon  
Ron Eddy, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Pat Hayes,  
David Johnson, Leo Jordan, Gordon Mills, Hugh P. O'Neil,  
Anthony Perruzza, Tony Ruprecht  
Clerk/Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Resources development/Développement des ressources**

Chair/Président: Bob Huget  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Mike Cooper  
Sean G. Conway, Joan M. Fawcett, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp,  
Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Turnbull,  
Daniel Waters, Gary Wilson, Len Wood  
Clerk/Greffière: Tannis Manikel

**Social development/Affaires sociales**

Chair/Président: Charles Beer  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ron Eddy  
Jenny Carter, Dianne Cunningham, Randy R. Hope,  
Tony Martin, Dalton McGuinty, Larry O'Connor,  
Yvonne O'Neill, Stephen Owens, Tony Rizzo, Jim Wilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Douglas Arnott

These lists appear in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

Ces listes figurent dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et le premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.





# CONTENTS

Monday 21 March 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Lawrence Martin</b>  |      |
| Mr McIlash  | 5039 |
| <b>Landfill</b>   |      |
| Mr Tilson   | 5039 |
| <b>Scarborough Bluffs conservation</b>                                |      |
| Mr Frankford  | 5039 |
| <b>International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination</b> |      |
| Mr Curling  | 5039 |
| Mr Cooper   | 5040 |
| Mr Cousens  | 5040 |
| <b>French-language services</b>                                       |      |
| Mr Sterling   | 5040 |
| <b>Legislative Academy Awards</b>                                     |      |
| Mr Sorbara  | 5040 |
| <b>Algoma Steel Corp</b>  |      |
| Mr Mills  | 5041 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|                                 |            |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Unemployment</b>             |            |
| Mrs McLeod                      | 5042       |
| Mr Rae                          | 5042       |
| <b>Ontario Hydro</b>            |            |
| Mrs McLeod                      | 5043       |
| Mr Wildman                      | 5043, 5047 |
| Mr Stockwell                    | 5047       |
| <b>Labour legislation</b>       |            |
| Mr Harris                       | 5043       |
| Mr Pouliot                      | 5044       |
| Mr Jim Wilson                   | 5044       |
| Mrs McLeod                      | 5046       |
| Mr Rae                          | 5046, 5047 |
| Mr Mahoney                      | 5046       |
| <b>Social assistance reform</b> |            |
| Mr Harris                       | 5045       |
| Mr Rae                          | 5045       |
| <b>Public transportation</b>    |            |
| Mr Perruzza                     | 5047       |
| Ms Lankin                       | 5048       |
| <b>Ontario Hydro spending</b>   |            |
| Mr Elston                       | 5048       |
| Mr Wildman                      | 5048       |

## Workers' Compensation Board

|                          |      |
|--------------------------|------|
| Mrs Witmer               | 5049 |
| Mr Laughren              | 5049 |
| <b>Tendering process</b> |      |
| Mr Bisson                | 5049 |
| Ms Lankin                | 5050 |
| <b>Casinos</b>           |      |
| Mr McClelland            | 5050 |
| Ms Lankin                | 5050 |

## PETITIONS

|                                     |      |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| <b>Photo-radar</b>                  |      |
| Mr Bradley                          | 5051 |
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>           |      |
| Mr Cousens                          | 5051 |
| Mr Eddy                             | 5052 |
| Mr Elston                           | 5053 |
| Mrs Witmer                          | 5053 |
| <b>Land-lease communities</b>       |      |
| Mr Mills                            | 5051 |
| Mr O'Connor                         | 5052 |
| <b>Broadcast of question period</b> |      |
| Mr Daigeler                         | 5051 |
| <b>Landfill</b>                     |      |
| Mr Tilson                           | 5052 |
| <b>Senior citizens' housing</b>     |      |
| Mrs Cunningham                      | 5052 |
| <b>School accommodation</b>         |      |
| Mr Frankford                        | 5052 |
| <b>Proceeds of crime</b>            |      |
| Mr Carr                             | 5053 |
| <b>Education financing</b>          |      |
| Mr Abel                             | 5053 |
| <b>Health services</b>              |      |
| Mr Bradley                          | 5053 |

## MOTIONS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Private members' public business</b> |      |
| Mr Charlton                             | 5053 |
| Agreed to                               | 5054 |
| <b>Committee sitting</b>                |      |
| Mr Charlton                             | 5054 |
| Agreed to                               | 5054 |

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Standing committee on administration of justice, Mr Marchese</b>        |      |
| Mr Marchese  | 5054 |
| Report adopted   | 5054 |
| <b>Standing committee on finance and economic affairs, Mr Paul Johnson</b> |      |
| Mr Paul R. Johnson   | 5054 |
| Reports adopted  | 5054 |
| <b>Standing committee on general government, Mr Brown</b>                  |      |
| Mr Brown   | 5054 |
| Report adopted   | 5054 |
| <b>Standing committee on social development, Mr Eddy</b>                   |      |
| Mr Eddy  | 5054 |
| Report adopted   | 5054 |
| <b>Standing committee on administration of justice, Mr Marchese</b>        |      |
| Mr Marchese  | 5054 |
| Mr Runciman  | 5055 |
| Mr Elston  | 5057 |
| Mr Jackson   | 5060 |
| Mr Winninger   | 5063 |
| Mr Mammoliti   | 5065 |
| Mr Bradley   | 5066 |
| Mr Stockwell   | 5067 |
| Mr Mahoney   | 5068 |
| Report adopted   | 5071 |

## FIRST READINGS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 141, Mr Mahoney</b> |      |
| Mr Mahoney  | 5072 |
| Agreed to   | 5072 |

## OTHER BUSINESS

|                               |      |
|-------------------------------|------|
| <b>Visitors</b>               |      |
| The Speaker                   | 5041 |
| <b>Legislative pages</b>      |      |
| The Speaker                   | 5041 |
| <b>Government advertising</b> |      |
| Mr Daigeler                   | 5041 |

# TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 21 mars 1994

## PREMIÈRE LECTURE

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant la Loi sur les relations de travail, projet de loi 141, M. Mahoney</b> |      |
| M. Mahoney  | 5072 |

CA20N  
X1  
-D23

Gouvernement  
Publications



No. 100

N° 100

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 22 March 1994

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mardi 22 mars 1994



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

*50th anniversary*

**1944–1994**

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 22 March 1994

The House met at 1332.

Prayers.

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### LANDFILL

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** The people of Vaughan, and indeed of all York region, have been fighting for the past three years to convince the government of Ontario that their proposal to put a massive new waste fill—landfill—site in the city of Vaughan is both misguided and must be defeated.

The organization Vaughan CARES has been working diligently on behalf of the people of my community in order to ensure that this message about the disastrous effects of Bill 143 and the government's determination to arbitrarily select Vaughan as the site for a new 20-year dump site has been carried certainly throughout my riding and all of York region.

In addition, recently the people of Vaughan CARES took that message to the riding of York South, the riding represented by Bob Rae, the Premier of Ontario. They canvassed some 500 or more homes, doing a survey determining how many people supported the government's position on waste management and Bill 143. Amazingly, almost 90% of the people said they did not support the government's position. They rejected virtually every aspect of it, and they signed cards indicating that if the government does not change its mind, they will vote against the Premier in the next provincial election.

#### RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** Last week Team Harris toured eastern Ontario to enable people to come forth with their thoughts and ideas about how we can ensure growth and prosperity in rural Ontario. The name of our group is the Team Harris Task Force on Rural Economic Development. Our mission is to obtain public input as to how a government can provide the right environment so that people of rural Ontario can obtain their own economic prosperity.

In every town we visited, the message was clear: Government has become too big, unresponsive and unaccountable, and we as politicians had better learn to listen.

In my riding of Lanark-Renfrew, we held a town-hall-style public forum in the county town, Perth, which drew over 100 people from every corner of the riding. The meeting in Perth attracted a wide-ranging audience, including the wardens of both Lanark and Renfrew counties, the reeves, representatives of agriculture, tourism, housing, small business and many members of the general public.

The attendants at the Perth meeting gave us solid, commonsense proposals for development in eastern

## ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 22 mars 1994

Ontario. These proposals will form the policies that will put rural Ontario back on the right track when Mike Harris forms the next government.

#### TRANSIT SERVICES

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I'd like to draw the attention of the House to a new accessible transit service in the community of Whitchurch-Stouffville, of course in my riding of Durham-York.

In April 1990 a dedicated group of citizens in Whitchurch-Stouffville recognized the need for an accessible transit system in their community to help the disabled residents move about. I am pleased to announce to this House that in February of this year, the group, the Whitchurch-Stouffville Mobility Transit Committee, launched its service with the help of City-Peel Taxi company and the town of Whitchurch-Stouffville. That's a mouthful.

With the two accessible taxis, about 90 eligible users use the service. These taxis are making an average of four trips a day to help these citizens who would otherwise have a great deal of difficulty in getting about their community.

However, despite this service's great success, there is a serious problem that has developed, particularly travelling between the regional municipalities, and particularly between York region and Metro Toronto. Under the current Municipal Act regulations and the Metro Toronto taxi bylaw prohibiting cross-boundary accessible taxis, cross-boundary mobility for disabled taxis becomes very difficult. While it is possible to go from York region down to Metro and to go from Metro back, they have got to use different services, and of course the pickup to get these people home is very difficult. So we have a one-way service only.

This is a very small jurisdictional problem that obviously creates some significant mobility problems for the people concerned. I want to take this opportunity in this House to recognize the tremendous effort by the committee. I will be approaching Municipal Affairs and Metro council about this.

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY

**Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex South):** This government has recently been calling for greater safety on our highways, yet it appears that rather than coming up with real solutions that address the physical aspects of busy thoroughfares, it proposes actions that best suit its needs, such as a blatant revenue grab with the introduction of photo-radar; or, on the other hand, they act in a manner that best suits them politically. To illustrate this latter point, I would like to give you an example of how this government has obviously compromised the safety of its citizens in the name of sheer political expediency.



The Highway 3 bypass is a stretch of two-lane highway running from Ruthven, near Leamington, to Windsor. On Monday morning, March 14, a young man in his 20s died as a result of an accident on this stretch of highway, and there have been a number of accidents and deaths in the near past. Two other recent deaths, as a matter of fact, were the result of an accident between a school bus and an auto.

1340

In a Windsor Star article, a senior project manager for MTO's southwestern region said he has heard tales of woe from numerous concerned commuters on this stretch of highway.

The NDP candidate in the by-election said, "The funding is available to repair and widen this road, but will not be successful without an elected representative inside the government."

As a member of this Legislature and as a frequent commuter on this dangerous stretch of highway, I find it deplorable that these funds that are apparently available have not been used to make this a four-lane highway.

#### HOSPITAL BEDS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I rise today in support of a Collingwood area petition campaign which is being driven by members of the community who are concerned about the rash of bed closures at the Collingwood General and Marine Hospital.

I'm proud to say that I drafted this petition so that concerned citizens and labour groups could send a message to the NDP government that bed closures are killing jobs and they are threatening the provision of quality health care services in the Collingwood area.

Earlier this month the General and Marine Hospital board announced that eight beds would be closed because of budget pressures and social contract obligations. As a result, 20 more hospital-based jobs could be affected and more jobs and beds could also be hacked if the government acts on its threat to rip an additional \$214 million out of the budgets of Ontario hospitals. Just a few years ago we had 133 beds at Collingwood General and Marine Hospital. Today, and after last week's announcement, we have 74 beds left.

At the same time the government is forcing the General and Marine Hospital to cut beds at a stunning pace, the NDP refused to release the funds to redevelop the Collingwood hospital. Area residents have watched helplessly while the previous Liberal government announced this redevelopment funding twice and the NDP has followed with two reannouncements of its own. Seven years, two governments and four separate announcements later, Collingwood still has a hospital wing that was built in the 1880s.

If the NDP still cares about health care, it must give Collingwood a green light to rebuild its hospital and it must give all hospitals in this province some breathing space so that we can accurately assess the impact on the people of this province of these bed closures.

#### LANDFILL

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** I rise to share some good news about, of all things, a dump. After more than 10

years of planning and studies, the municipalities of Grimsby, Lincoln, Pelham and West Lincoln will get their much-needed new landfill site. It was approved this week without an environmental assessment hearing, thanks to the hard work of local politicians who make up the joint board of waste management, also known as the dump board.

Reaching this agreement took a great deal of time and effort from both the dump board and the Ministry of Environment and Energy, but it was well worth it. Avoiding a hearing means huge savings for the province and the four municipalities, which is very good news for the taxpayers.

The new landfill site, to be located in West Lincoln, is the second all-new landfill site approved without a hearing under the province's new, streamlined environmental assessment review process.

While planning for their new dump, the four municipalities implemented one of Ontario's most effective waste diversion programs. In 1985 they were one of the first jurisdictions in Ontario to introduce the blue box program, and they have since banned compostable and yard waste from their existing landfill site in Grimsby.

Also, they have provided backyard composters for all households and established Niagara region's first permanent household hazardous waste depot, and they've launched a highly effective promotion and advertising program.

I offer sincere congratulations to my local politicians and the staff who worked so hard on this project. I fully believe that the people of Lincoln riding are the most efficient recyclers in all of Canada.

#### NATIVE HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora):** My statement is for the Minister of Health. I rise today on behalf of the residents of Red Lake, Ear Falls, Golden and the remote first nation communities to the north of these three. These folks are totally frustrated with the Minister of Health's refusal to address the legitimate concerns of physicians who staff the emergency department at the Red Lake Margaret Cochenour Memorial Hospital.

For over 18 months the physicians in Red Lake have been in discussions with ministry officials and staff regarding the issue of fee-for-service compensation for doctors covering emergency services in the Red Lake Margaret Cochenour Memorial Hospital.

As a result of this government's inaction, the five doctors who work at the Red Lake hospital's emergency department informed the minister, hospital board and communities many months ago that they will not provide emergency coverage past March 31, 1994.

The hospital board and residents have requested the minister's attendance at a public meeting in Red Lake this Thursday, March 24. As I stated, the residents of these communities are facing the imminent closure of their emergency department and possibly the hospital.

The minister has an obligation to assure my constituents that there will be no interruption of health services at Red Lake Margaret Cochenour Memorial Hospital. I will be attending the March 24 meeting in Red Lake, and

should the minister not be in attendance, I would like to know what information this government will provide me to alleviate the concerns of my constituents. Does this minister really have a plan?

LORING DEER YARD

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** I rise in the House today to call upon the Minister of Natural Resources to personally review the investigation conducted by his ministry relating to some 15 deer which were killed at the Loring deer yard recently. As the minister will be aware, the MNR officials who led this investigation have decided not to lay charges against the alleged perpetrators.

This winter and others, MNR officials and local fish and game clubs have been providing food for deer at the Loring deer yard. The 12,000 deer at this yard are estimated to be the largest concentration of deer in the entire province of Ontario. The Loring deer yard has become a very popular viewing spot for old and young people alike.

My main concern is that of public safety. Both my office and that of Mike Harris, whose constituency borders on mine, have received numerous telephone calls from concerned residents and constituents. We have heard stories that shots may have actually been fired towards the raised viewing platform and may have even been fired from the viewing platform.

Conservation is the other issue at the heart of this matter. In late winter and early spring deer are quite vulnerable. They are starving, and a good number of female deer are pregnant. The fact that a feeding station is a baited area cannot be overlooked.

I must express my disappointment with the manner in which this matter has been dealt with by MNR officials. The MNR officials have now removed the deer feeders and posted signs warning visitors that the public may be in danger because of hunting at the feeding and viewing stations. I am not confident that the MNR has acted in the interests of either public safety or conservation.

PETERBOROUGH GREEN-UP

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** I want to congratulate Peterborough Green-Up on having passed their 1,000th green home visit. The green communities initiative which the Ministry of Environment and Energy is funding in several communities is a win-win project and a fine example of sustainable, community-based economic development. It creates jobs where we need them: in the community where people live. It is good value, because it lessens our need for costly infrastructure by reducing the use of energy and water and the generation of waste.

I am very proud that the Ontario government is supporting this initiative. Green-Up exemplifies the positive message that environmental, economic and social goals can be pursued in a mutually supportive fashion.

The green home visit program has generated more than \$1 million in expenditures to local firms doing renovations or providing insulation, new furnaces, windows etc. This impact will rise to \$2 million next year, when Green-Up plans to visit 2,000 homes. Green-Up has many

other projects, including a major toilet retrofit program to reduce the flow of waste water.

David McLeod and all his staff are a wonderful group of people, rooted in the community to which they are giving so much. Thank you, all of you.

VISITOR

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to bring to the Speaker's and other members' attention that the member-elect for Victoria-Haliburton, Chris Hodgson, is in the gallery.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I thank the member for his point of order.

It is now time for oral questions.

*Interjections.*

ORAL QUESTIONS

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: As my colleagues are pointing out, it is a little bit difficult to pose questions when there are so few members of the cabinet present to respond. I did understand that the Minister of Labour was to be present. May I ask of the government House leader whether in fact the Minister of Labour is expected?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Can the government House leader assist?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** To the best of my knowledge, the Minister of Labour is expected, yes.

**The Speaker:** Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to stand down her first question?

1350

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** I will place my first question to the Minister of Education and Training, and wait for the arrival of the Minister of Labour.

I am concerned about a statement which was made in a letter some months ago, a letter that was written by Mr Jim Turk, who is a government appointee to the Council of Regents for the community colleges. Mr Turk's letter is addressing the matter of appointments to college boards of governors and raises the issue of whether or not boards are sufficiently representative of the population.

The statement in the letter which causes me concern is this: "In other words, although there are more women and more visible minorities, they are remarkably like the white men that they have replaced."

Minister, we have already seen that your government has pursued an approach to employment equity in a way which excludes white men. Mr Turk's comments push this kind of exclusionary approach to seemingly new limits. I ask you today, how far does this go? What criteria do you have to meet in order to be appointed to a board in Bob Rae's Ontario?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** When I became aware of the comments that Mr Turk had made, I very much expressed my upset at those comments. They do not reflect this government's point of view and they do not reflect the Ministry of Education and Training's point of view.



I also want to indicate to the member that I felt strongly enough about it that I wrote to the chair of the Council of Regents and indicated in writing that our ministry and our government did not agree with Mr Turk's comments, that he was not speaking for the government, and that's where it stands.

**Mrs McLeod:** I'm sure you are aware that individuals who now sit on college boards were very offended by Mr Turk's comments as well. One of the people who was offended was a Conestoga College board member, Jacqueline Mitchell, who happens to be female and happens to be black. Her reported comments are: "First of all, he's stereotyping me as a visible minority, then he's stereotyping me as a white man, so he's insulting me. I'm not here as a token." Minister, I trust you would agree that tokenism is not employment equity.

I appreciate the fact that you have taken some offence at Mr Turk's comments yourself and that you have written to the Council of Regents. I ask whether or not you would share that letter with us and whether your letter makes it abundantly clear to the Council of Regents and to people across this province that the policy for appointments on the part of this government is that they are open to all who are qualified and are willing to serve. Will you make it absolutely clear that there is no hidden ideological agenda and there is not to be any hidden ideological agenda applied, a hidden test of how people think before they are considered to be eligible to serve?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I would be glad to share the letter I've written to the chair of the Council of Regents with the member where it specifically refers to Mr Turk's comments. Mr Turk was appointed by the Liberal government to the Council of Regents.

I would also like to make it absolutely clear to the Leader of the Opposition that the policy of the Council of Regents and the policy of our government is one of inclusion for boards of governors. We want boards of governors for colleges to reflect the communities in which they reside.

There is currently a consultation going on that flows out of the Stephen Lewis report and there will be recommendations that come forward from the Council of Regents in terms of policy for appointments to boards of governors. Ultimately that policy will be decided by myself as minister, and I would be glad to have your involvement or the involvement of your critic in the development or review of that proposed policy from the Council of Regents.

**Mrs McLeod:** To pick up on your comment that the appointments to boards of governors of colleges should be reflective of the communities in which they reside, I would then like to ask you to respond to a concern that has arisen about what appears to be an exclusionary practice on the part of the Council of Regents.

Conestoga College recommended that Mr Larry Zepf be appointed to its board. Mr Zepf is a graduate of Conestoga College. He has established a successful high-tech business in the Kitchener-Waterloo area. He employs graduates and students of the college. He is clearly a leading citizen of the Kitchener-Waterloo community and is eager to give back to the college. Mr Zepf's appoint-

ment, we understand, was vetoed in favour of the appointment of a teachers' union employee who works in Toronto.

Minister, would you not clearly agree that Mr Zepf was a qualified appointee, can you explain why his appointment would have been vetoed for any reason other than the exercise of an exclusionary policy, and will you then ensure that this kind of exclusionary practice stops?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition, as a former Minister of Colleges and Universities, understands that the Council of Regents appoints members of the board. There will be a policy and there should be a policy in place in terms of the criteria and the objectives of the process for appointing members to the board. That policy will have to be approved by the government, so that's where our responsibility is, up front.

If the member is inquiring about a specific appointment, which I can tell you I know nothing about, if she wants information on that she should go, as she would understand, to the chair of the Council of Regents and ask that specific question.

I can tell the member that 90% of the names that come forward from boards of governors from colleges are approved by the council for appointment—90%. So there's no plot; there's no hidden agenda here. The fact of the matter is that the vast majority of the names for boards of governors comes from the boards of governors themselves and the Council of Regents accepts that.

**Mrs McLeod:** I will then await the clarification, with the minister's written response, on exactly the kinds of policies that his government will pursue, and we will expect to see those reflected in the policies adopted by the Council of Regents.

#### FAMILY FARMS

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** The Minister of Labour has returned, and I would place my second question to him. I am concerned about the plans you have in place to unionize family farms under Bill 91. I raised this issue with the minister last fall and the minister—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mrs McLeod:** If the members opposite are not aware that this is a concern for people in rural communities, they have not been listening—

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** If you were so concerned, you wouldn't mislead the public.

**The Speaker:** The member for Sarnia knows better. I ask the member to withdraw that unparliamentary remark.

**Mr Huget:** Withdrawn, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The Leader of the Opposition with her question.

**Mrs McLeod:** I can appreciate the fact that perhaps the member for Sarnia has not been speaking to people who are farming outside the Sarnia community, but I can assure him that the members of my caucus and I have been talking to people who are extremely concerned

about this government's legislation intended to unionize the family farm.

This is not the first time we have raised the issue with the Minister of Labour. When we raised this issue in the fall, the minister insisted that the legislation he was presenting to this House met the concerns of the farm community that were set out in the Agriculture-Labour task force report.

We would agree that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture was willing to accept the task report framework, but this federation, in a report on February 9 to cabinet, said very clearly that Bill 91 in its present form cannot provide that framework. The OFA goes on to list five specific examples of the way in which this minister's bill betrays the recommendations of the task force report.

Minister, will you now admit that Bill 91 is fundamentally flawed? Will you make a commitment today to the farm groups to talk to them, to fix the legislation, to keep the promises that you made to the farmers of this province?

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** I reject the contention of the leader of the official opposition. There has been extensive consultation with the farm community and there is agreement with the bill and the amendments we've agreed to make to it at this point in time. I can't understand where she's getting her information from.

1400

**Mrs McLeod:** I would be more than happy to give the minister the opportunity to tell us exactly what his amendments are and whether his amendments respond to the broken promises which the Ontario Federation of Agriculture identified in its February 9 brief to cabinet. Let me just remind the minister of just three of those areas where the OFA believed that this minister had betrayed his commitments so that he can assure that his amendments address those areas.

Firstly, under the Agricultural Labour Relations Task Force, there was a promise of new and separate labour legislation. Bill 91, as we have seen it, only makes amendments to the existing Labour Relations Act. The task force minister recommended that no family member be forced to join a union, but under Bill 91, as we have seen it, uncles, aunts, nephews, part of the larger family, could be forced to join a union. Perhaps most importantly, the task force said that any new legislation must prevent strikes. Bill 91 is silent on that issue.

Will you explain why your original legislation betrayed these recommendations and will you assure us specifically that any recommendations will address the OFA's concerns?

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** I know of few pieces of legislation where we have had as much consultation as we have had on this bill. I certainly got a clear message when I spoke to the OFA last year on proceeding with the piece of legislation. We did set up a committee again, after the bill was in the House last fall. They have gone through it once again and have suggested some additional amendments. Most of them are minor. We've agreed to them and we'll be before the House with that bill very shortly.

I can't understand where some of the false information you're picking up is coming from.

**Mrs McLeod:** I made it abundantly clear to the minister where the concerns were coming from. The concerns were coming from the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. They were very specifically stated in a February 9 brief to cabinet. They have been echoed in the concerns that we have heard from farmers across this province. These are not minor amendments. These are fundamental issues of the family farm being able to continue, they are fundamental issues of the need for agriculture to have separate legislation and they are fundamental issues about the impossibility of farm organizations continuing if there is not a guarantee against strike action.

I say to the minister that this is a very important issue to people in agriculture, an industry that is struggling to survive. The only response of this government to this group of people has been to change the name of the Ministry of Agriculture. I ask the minister today, if he does not understand how important these changes to Bill 91 are to make sure that the family farm can continue and that agricultural jobs can be protected, will he assure us that he will present amendments that deal with each of those five concerns of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture?

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** The only difficulty I have is that I don't think it would matter what I told the member across the way. I don't think she's read the bill carefully. She certainly will be satisfied, I'm sure, when she sees the amendments. If not, nothing will satisfy her.

#### STUDENT SUSPENSION

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My first question is to the Minister of Education. One of the most crucial issues in our schools today is the issue of violence, the issue of ensuring that our children can, in the classrooms, attend school free from fear of violence, that they can feel secure. Last spring, you amended the Education Act with a series of amendments that were called "house-keeping."

One of those amendments, and I'd like to quote from your own explanatory note to that bill, said, "The suspension of a pupil will not be able to exceed 20 school days." The Scarborough Board of Education believes that if it had the discretion to suspend some students for violent behaviour beyond 20 days, it would be able to consider fewer expulsions. If school boards believe that they can more effectively combat violence in our schools with longer suspensions, why are you preventing them from doing just that?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I don't believe that there can be any credible accusation that the Ministry of Education is doing anything but developing the most comprehensive policy to fight violence in our school system that has ever been developed in the history of this province, and the member knows that.

If the leader of the third party is actually saying that an additional tool that should be available to the schools is to have what amounts to expulsion by the use of a



suspension, then I disagree. The law now says that a student can be expelled or suspended for up to a month without it going to the trustees.

There's got to be accountability in our education system and the accountability means that there has to be some accountability to the board, and that means that if a board feels or the principal feels that there should be a longer suspension, that can be done under the act by the board, or if there is an expulsion, then that can be done by the board. That's accountability and that will fight violence in our system more than leaving it up in the air, as was the case under the Education Act for many years.

**Mr Harris:** Your amendment specifically stated, and the explanatory note of what the legalese was, that the suspension will not be able to exceed 20 days. That was passed in the bill in spite of the fact that the Ontario public school boards were opposed. The boards themselves, which you say you want to have control—it was so they could have control—were opposed to this amendment.

Our critic, if you will recall, attempted to amend your legislation to give boards the option of longer suspensions, but you voted us down. You voted the critic down. We spent a couple of days, I think, if you'll recall, talking about what was supposed to be at that time a housekeeping piece of legislation.

Clearly the goal that each of us would share, whether educators or legislators or parents or students, is to ensure a safe school environment for our children. And in the absence, and it has been an absence, of leadership from you—you've been falling behind on this from day one—school boards are now asking that they be given the option of suspending a violent student for more than 20 days. Will you amend the bill so that they can suspend, or clarify that they can suspend, beyond 20 days?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I'm not going to argue about whose lawyers are correct. The legal opinion from the Ministry of Education is that the boards already have that power. We've explained that to the Metro representatives from the school boards, but I don't think that is the basis of the argument.

If a board wants a student to be removed from the school system for a longer period of time, it has that power under the Education Act and it's called an expulsion. Under that section of the act, a student has the right to apply to the board to be re-entered into the school system, so the board should set some expectations and conditions for that student to get back into the system.

I really believe that we're arguing about nothing. The board has that power and the board has a lot of tools in order to deal with this, but if you believe that a student should be expelled by the use of longer suspensions, I don't agree with that. That in fact means that there's no accountability and gives power to principals that I think goes beyond what should be allowed for in the Education Act.

**Mr Harris:** You are trying to represent that expulsions and suspensions are the same things. Expulsions are a very serious matter—that's it, tout fini, you're expelled, you're out. Then you're into the legal system, then you're

into the cost, then you're into the rest of it.

What school boards are telling you is that there was a tool that they had between the suspension—maximum 20 days—and expulsion and they are asking for that tool. They believe it's an important tool and it is you who has taken it away from them and they are asking to get it back.

Secondly, it is still concerning many of the boards and certainly concerning us, that in the absence of any provincial leadership on expulsions, where children are supposed to go to school once they've been expelled—the fact of the matter is, you've sat back. In the absence of any provincial program to ensure a spot for children who have been expelled, school boards really are left in a vacuum. It's either a pilot project or try to get them into another board, and they're asking for leadership from you as well on this. No student should fall through a crack in our education system because you can't get your act together.

1410

I would ask you two things: Will you make it easier and give them the tool of longer suspensions so they don't have to go the expulsion route, and in those rare cases where the expulsion route is taken will you ensure that there will be a place, a program, a school, for every student in this province following expulsion? Will you ensure that takes place on a province-wide basis as quickly as possible?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I really don't understand the logic of the leader of the third party, because what he is basically saying is that he would like to have the Education Act changed so that kids can be expelled by using the route of suspensions. I don't agree with that.

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** No, he's not.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** It's exactly what he's saying. He's saying that he would use suspensions and have longer suspensions. That is nonsense. It's politically popular, but it's nonsense.

In terms of programs for students who are expelled, I think the member should also realize that expulsions are not new to Ontario's system. They've existed for many, many years. What we are trying to do, in cooperation with the boards, is to put those alternative programs in place. We've said that we'll do it under a pilot project, and that's all we can afford to do at this point in time. We'd like to have programs right across the province. There's not the amount of money available that we need to do that, so we'll do a pilot project. If the member is suggesting that we should find money someplace else and increase the deficit in order to fund it, let him say that.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** New question.

**Mr Harris:** I don't think the solution is to tell school boards that what they want is nonsense. I don't think that is helping—

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I said what you said.

**Mr Harris:** What I said is what the school boards are asking for.

**The Speaker:** And your second question?

## MANDATORY RETIREMENT

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** In the absence of the Premier and the Attorney General, who I understand are off to open the new Bill Davis courthouse, I would like to direct my next question to the Deputy Premier.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** The deputy Deputy Premier?

**Mr Harris:** No, I'll go right to the Deputy Premier today.

This morning the Toronto Sun reported that your government is firing 90 senior citizens from their part-time contracts—half of these are Second World War veterans—in order to meet some employment equity targets. The Globe and Mail estimates that number, by the way, at 200. Whether it is 200 or whether it is 90 or whether it is one, I couldn't believe this type of insensitivity, this type of inhumanity would be carried out by a government in Ontario.

Is it true that you've given the pink slip, you're actually firing 90 elderly Ontarians who work for the Ministry of the Attorney General from their part-time contract work for the sake of somebody's definition of political correctness?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Deputy Premier):** It has nothing to do with political correctness, to which the leader of the third party refers. It's my understanding that the Attorney General is applying the same kind of rules for unclassified courtroom staff as apply for the public sector in general. As a matter of fact, my understanding is that she's doing it in a very, very humane way, in a phased-in way, to people who are 65, 70, 75 years old.

I'm not sure that the leader of the third party has his facts correct, but is he suggesting that there should not be a program in which people who are well over the age of 65, in some cases, should be treated equally with the way other people in the public sector are treated? Is that what he's saying?

**Mr Harris:** Judge Campbell said, "It's one thing to have affirmative action in hiring; it's another thing to fire people for affirmative action purposes." These are not employees; they're not on the civil service payroll. They are contract positions. They are part-time positions. Some call them commissionaire-type positions. They are positions, the courts have told you, where the jobs they have done have been carried out in an exemplary fashion. They are elderly workers who after you have fired them from these part-time contract positions, will no longer have the dignity of providing a public service, will no longer have that extra little bit of income, because you are tossing them aside and you are replacing them with people for the purposes you have deemed are politically correct. I would ask you again, if this is what's happening, will you put a stop to this nonsense today?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** It's my understanding that all that's happening is that people who are over the age of 65, in some cases 70 and 75, are being asked to take retirement, as are other people in the public sector. I don't think there's anything unusual about asking people who are over the age of 65 to take retirement. It's being done in a very humane and staged way and those people

are being replaced, it's my understanding, by people who are on the surplus list who are certainly under the age of 65. So I'm not sure why the leader of the third party is objecting.

Is the leader of the third party saying that there should be no limits whatsoever on people in this particular category of employment, nobody else in the public sector but in this particular category of employment there should be absolutely no rules on retirement whatsoever? Is that what the leader of the third party is saying?

**Mr Harris:** Mr Deputy Premier, your government has gone too far. You stand in this House day in and day out and preach to the rest of the public about fairness and equity. Some of these people were hired on their contracts when they were already 65. In many cases it was because they were 65 that they were given the part-time contracts. I suggest to you that if you will look into this—I don't know where you're getting your information from—I believe that you, on behalf of your government, will feel ashamed.

In half the cases we're talking about Second World War veterans who fought for each and every one of us in this House. In many cases we're talking about a part-time supplementary income, in many cases people who have been brought on after they reached the age of 65. You are not asking them to leave; you're firing them. Will you change this policy today and allow these people the dignity, as long as they're capable of doing the contract, of carrying on and doing the job for which they were retained in the first place?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** The fact that these people are over the age of 65 and are being asked to take retirement does not mean they have not served their country extremely well. Of course they have. I hope you won't try and paint a picture in which people who have served their country well are not being treated fairly. That's simply not the case. If the Tory party in this province is now on the record as saying it is opposed to mandatory retirement in the public sector, then let them stand in their place and say so. I'll tell you these—

**Mr Eves:** That's not what we said at all. They're not public servants. They're hired because they are 65. They are part-time employees and you're firing them, not retiring them. I know it's difficult to grasp, but put it in your head and keep it there.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. Had the minister completed his response?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I'll try and—

**Mr Harris:** The only job creation you've got is to fire somebody else to create a job.

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** Quit playing politics.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Could the minister complete his response, please.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Mr Speaker, I shall try, but as soon as I raise the issue that the Tory party now is opposed to mandatory retirement in the public sector,



they go strange over there. They start yelling and shouting and screaming at me. I don't understand what they're talking about.

1420

**Mr Eves:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Could the Deputy Premier please show us, or could you show us, an Instant Hansard where the leader of the third party said that he's in favour of mandatory retirement? I'd like to see it.

**The Speaker:** The member will know that he does not have a point of order.

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I shall try very hard to refrain from teasing the bears.

**Mr Hugh O'Neil (Quinte):** Come on, Floyd, get to the point.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I will get to the point; I'm trying to get to the point. The fact is that the people to whom the leader of the third party is referring are in the public sector and are paid for by the taxpayers of this province. All I'm suggesting to the leader of the third party is that if we were to change the policy and say that there is no requirement that these people take retirement over the age of 65, is he then saying by extension that all the public sector now has no mandatory requirement? Is that what he's saying? That's a strange way to deal with the creation of jobs in the province of Ontario.

#### MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION SPENDING

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Mr Minister, are you aware that at approximately 10 o'clock this morning 196 of the senior management people in your ministry boarded a bus bound for the Nottawasaga Inn for two days of meetings to discuss their relationship with the staff in the ministry?

If so, sir, were you aware that there are costs associated with this two-day junket of \$31,000 for rooms, food and booze for these people, \$5,000 for travel that actually includes flying people into Pearson and then busing them up to the Nottawasaga Inn for this retreat, \$10,000 in staff costs specifically paid to try to organize this particular two-day junket for your senior staff, and \$6,000 in consultant costs to come in to tell your senior management staff how they can better get along with the junior management staff in your ministry?

Minister, are you aware of this almost \$52,000 junket being expended by your senior staff, 196 bureaucrats enjoying two days at the Nottawasaga Inn at the expense of the taxpayer?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** I welcome the interest and the inquiry vis-à-vis those women and men who are providing essential services by way of the Ministry of Transportation to the province of Ontario. Let's keep things in the right context, please. Given the decentralized nature of Transportation Ontario, we're talking about 9,700 employees from all over the province, 22,000 kilometres of road, 3,000 bridges and on and on. We're decentralized indeed. So 196 managers right outside here using a chartered bus, two people to a room, a semiannual meeting is nothing, peanuts, has no

relevance compared to what you people spent when you were on this side of the House. This is no Taj Mahal. This is managers, those are leaders, meeting twice a year to make the system even better. I thank the member opposite for his interest.

**Mr Mahoney:** Well, Minister, not only do I have some interest, but a lot of the staff in your department have some interest and are pretty upset at what they see as a very blatant waste of the taxpayers' money. At a time in this economy when you're asking them to take Rae days off without pay, you don't mind sending these—why didn't you bring them to Queen's Park? Nobody is suggesting they shouldn't get together and talk about the future of the ministry. Nobody is suggesting they shouldn't get together and talk about their relationship with their junior members of staff.

Why would you have to send them to a posh resort north of this city, at a cost in excess of \$50,000 for two days, to discuss issues of concern to everybody in this province, when you have meeting rooms sitting empty right here at Queen's Park, right in your own ministry, where these people could have got together and talked?

Listen to this: This sounds like a wonderful time. Maybe you're the dinner speaker tonight; I'm not sure. It says, "Tuesday's dinner banquet will be served in a private ballroom at the Nottawasaga Inn." It sounds very nice.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place his question, please.

**Mr Mahoney:** They have a happy-hour session here. They have cocktails. Minister, you just don't get it. The taxpayers are fed up with this kind of irresponsible spending.

**The Speaker:** Would the member place his question.

**Mr Mahoney:** Will you assure this House, Minister, that you will stop authorizing this kind of expenditure and be a responsible minister and satisfy the concerns of all the staff at the MTO?

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** The member is right. We should spend a moment or two in looking at cost comparison. What we're looking at here is \$95 per person. A few short years back—the official opposition was the government then—14 people went to Italy and it cost \$1,000 for the room alone per person, \$14,000 per night for elected officials. Those are public servants, putting their best foot forward at \$95 per day, including meals. This is 1994. He is still in the age of horse-and-buggy. When is he going to wake up and smell the roses? Get a grip on. Get a life.

**The Speaker:** New question.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

#### PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Minister, earlier this month the Premier demanded that Metropolitan Toronto council find municipal tax dollars to fund four subway lines, and if they didn't, the infrastructure funding for the new trade centre in Metropolitan Toronto would be in jeopardy.

Minister, you're aware that the Metropolitan Toronto capital program for TTC improvements is completely separate and distinct from the federal-provincial-municipal infrastructure program. The two are not linked. You're also aware that the taxpayers of Metropolitan Toronto have said no to additional property taxes and the Metropolitan Toronto council has said no to additional property taxes.

The question, Minister, is, will you give us your commitment today, yes or no, that you will not use the infrastructure program as a form of blackmail to impose your will on the democratically elected Metropolitan Toronto council?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** It's not my style nor the style of this government to use blackmail to impose will on anybody, on any municipality. That's not the intent of the discussions that we've entered into with Metro.

1430

I will be very straight with the member and say that we have an interest, a very strong interest, in seeing all four subway projects proceed. We believe it is possible without imposing tax increases on the residents of Metro. We think there are ways in which the financing can be accomplished and we're working with Metro to try and pursue those ways and to try and put forward a proposal which would see all four subway lines under way and which would see 60,000-odd people back to work in Toronto, as opposed to the 30,000.

I've said all along that the 30,000 to 35,000 jobs that would be created by getting two lines started are good. We welcome that decision by Metro. We're there, we're supportive of seeing two lines go forward, but we think more can be done.

Metro council's resolution and decision did not close the door on the other two lines. They've set up a committee to explore financing. We're working on it with them and we're in a period of negotiations. My very, very strong belief and hope is that all four subway lines and the Metro trade centre can be commenced before the end of the year.

**Mr David Johnson:** The question about the infrastructure program is not a complicated one. The answer is either, "Yes, I respect the rights of the municipal councils to make a democratic decision and represent their people," or the answer is no and that you feel it necessary to threaten the municipalities to get your way. Which one is it? Is it yes or no?

With respect to other forms of financing, we all support the private sector being involved in the subway projects, but nobody seriously believes there is enough private sector funding to pay for two additional subway lines.

I'm asking you, will you give an undertaking not to force Metro to increase taxes and not to get involved in some funding formula, an unreasonable and unworkable funding formula, that can't possibly work except to result in additional tax increases?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I think in all of the statements that I've made on this subject, it would be obvious that my

answer to both those questions is no. No, we're not threatening anyone, and no, we wouldn't force a funding formula that would force an increase in taxes.

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I don't understand the member properly from Don Mills. I know you make a reference twice to all the "blackmails." I'm just wondering if there are any "whitemails" around here.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member does not have a point of privilege.

#### CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES

**Mr Noel Duignan (Halton North):** My question today is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Last year the Association of Conservation Authorities of Ontario produced a report called A Blueprint for Success, and their proposals could save \$100 million a year. The authorities continue to claim that there is \$100 million to be saved by reducing duplication in resource management and giving them more responsibility.

I'm also aware that many people have criticized the report as lacking substance and simply being an attempt to gain increased funding at a time when other government agencies are having to reduce spending. I'm also aware that the report gives no details on where the money can be found.

What I and my conservation authorities want to know is, has the minister done any analysis of the claims made in the blueprint document on the potential for cost savings from reducing duplication?

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** I thank the member for a very relevant question. In fact we've had some time to review the report of the association of conservation authorities called A Blueprint for Success.

I should say to the member that the assertion that somehow \$100 million can be produced out of thin air is indeed an absurd assertion in this day and age. The reality is that the association of conservation authorities, while every other public body in the province is constraining and working hard to constrain their budgets, insists that it should have more money. We have given the conservation authorities some suggestions as to how they could produce more efficiency and how they could work more effectively.

The Provincial Auditor in his report last year made the following comments. He said that over 15 of the 38 conservation authorities spend over 33% of their budget on administration. Imagine that: in this day and age of tough economic times, spending over 33% of your budget on administration. The auditor also suggested that some of the smaller conservation authorities should amalgamate to save money and some should look at—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Hampton:** —copayment for services to save money.

We expect the same sort of dedicated effort in these tough economic times from conservation authorities as we expect from everyone else.



**Mr Duignan:** I appreciate the answer by the minister. However, when I read stories like this in the newspaper and when I listen to concerns from my conservation authorities and I also listen to concerns from my constituents, and that is the threat by some conservation authorities to sell significant natural areas if the province does not provide additional funding, I wonder, can the minister tell me, tell the constituents and tell the conservation authorities what progress has been made in developing a longer-term solution to ensuring taxes can be paid on significant lands owned by the conservation authorities and that these lands will not be sold to the private sector?

**Hon Mr Hampton:** First of all, last year we within the Ministry of Natural Resources reallocated \$2.3 million in funding to cover the taxes on some of the lands owned by conservation authorities. We indicated at that time that we were willing to work with conservation authorities to find longer-term solutions to this problem. However, simply asking for more money in these tough economic times is not an answer and it is not a reasonable request either.

I should say to the member that one of the things that is unfortunately left out in some of the statements that conservation authorities make is that they cannot sell conservation lands without the permission of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. So to threaten that conservation authorities will sell lands is simply a threat that has no reality. Those lands can't be sold without the permission and without an order in council from cabinet.

Secondly, the reality is that if there are some lands that conservation authorities want to sell and they're not strictly conservation lands, they can't sell or lease those. The Ministry of Natural Resources can use a number of legislative mechanisms, including the federal Fisheries Act and the federal fisheries regulations to ensure that the sensitive parts of those non-conservation lands continue to be protected.

#### TUITION FEES

**Mr Dalton J. P. McGuinty (Ottawa South):** My question is for the Minister of Education and Training. In December past, my colleague the member for York-Mackenzie asked you if you were planning to accept the 14% increase in tuition fees over two years which had been recommended to you by your officials. You said you rejected that recommendation, and the one million or so people in this province who were enrolled in our colleges and universities were grateful for that. But that was then.

We are now hearing that you will be announcing shortly a 20% increase over two years in tuition fees. This would mean that the legacy of your party, the party that promised to freeze and even eliminate tuition fees, would be to have raised tuition fees by 42%. Mr Minister, can you assure Ontario's college and university students that you have not changed your mind since December 3 and that you still feel that a 7% annual increase or anything higher is unacceptable?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I think that the member should just hang in there and wait until the announcement is made. I would just ask him also not to really rewrite what I said last

year. I said I rejected the recommendation. I did not indicate anything about a view of that rate, anything lower or anything higher. I said the policy was being reviewed.

**Mr McGuinty:** Let me address something then that I'm sure the minister would agree that he has been saying. He's been saying that we're going to be seeing a substantial tuition fee increase and that this is the fault of the federal government. Let me share three important facts on this matter.

First fact: The federal transfer payments for colleges' and universities' funding remain the same this year as in years past. No cuts have been made to this funding.

Point number 2: Every province in Canada receives the same per capita funding when it comes to colleges and universities. Ontario is not the subject of any discrimination when it comes to funding of our colleges and universities.

Point number 3, and this is very important: The numbers show that between 1990 and 1994, in terms of actual dollars paid to Ontario, transfers from the feds for health and post-secondary education have increased by 25%, but this minister has only passed on 18% to colleges and universities. He's actually held back money given by the feds for colleges and universities, and this government has decided to use it elsewhere.

1440

I ask the minister to inform this House now how it is that he can blame the federal government for tuition fee increases when no cuts are being made to this funding and when he hasn't even been passing along all of the funding he's already getting from the feds.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I think that's a rather silly way to take a look at the numbers that a provincial government must deal with. We have to take a look at the bottom line, and the bottom line is that the previous federal government had been ripping off the province of Ontario for a number of years, and the current Liberal government did nothing to correct that problem.

As a result, we have to do something to inject more money into the college and university system and we still have to pay our other bills. That's the reality. No matter how Liberals try to defend Martin's budget, the fact of the matter is that Ontario is being discriminated against by the current federal government, just as we were before. If he wants to do something about it, he should go talk to Paul Martin and Jean Chrétien.

#### ROLE OF MINISTER

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** To the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, it's great to see you back following this serious car accident. We hope that you're able to shed the crutches very soon.

Now to the question: While you were convalescing, the Premier recognized there were areas outside of Toronto called food-producing areas in rural Ontario and decided to change the name of your ministry to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. Mr Minister, how much more power and money do you now have?

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** I didn't hear the announce-

ment about having any additional money, but I understand that I will have additional influence. This is not about power, but it's about influence in terms of rural Ontario and recognizing the interests of rural communities in our efforts to create jobs and maintain the population of rural Ontario and economic growth in rural Ontario where it belongs instead of all moving to the cities where it's not necessarily needed today.

**Mr Villeneuve:** I think the minister said, between the lines, that political correctness is more important than power and influence.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Downsview.

**Mr Villeneuve:** The minister realizes and knows full well that the Ministry of Labour will be operating Bill 91, which involves and affects agriculture very directly. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs, with the Sewell commission, will be very much overpowering your ministry. The Ministry of Environment and Energy does it all the time. The Ministry of Natural Resources does it all the time with the designation of wetlands etc.

Mr Minister, we are with you, we want you to have more power. Would you convey to your friends at the cabinet table that you are the lead minister in rural affairs and food production? Please, could you convey this to the Premier now that he knows there is a food-producing area out there?

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** Some of my friends at the cabinet table think I already have too much to say when it comes to representing rural Ontario, but I want to say a couple of things in response to the question.

What the Premier was doing was recognizing the role we have been playing unofficially over the last year or so. In fact, within my ministry we have now designated 51 people, I believe it is, across the province in our field offices who are involved in looking at community economic development in rural Ontario. We have been a spokesperson and we have worked with other ministries, and the member mentioned a few, that are from time to time a concern for rural Ontarians.

I want to give the member an example of the kind of thing we've been doing. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations just handed me a letter as I came to the House today. The member didn't mention this particular program but it was one that was announced over the wintertime by the Ontario New Home Warranty Program. In the rural newspapers across this province, that particular agency, which is a crown agency, I believe, or—

**The Speaker:** Would the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** —an appointed body from that ministry, had decided that septic tanks in rural Ontario would have to have a civil engineer's drawing before they could be put in place. Immediately upon hearing that, I went to the minister and we lobbied very hard for her to talk to that agency to have that reversed.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** I have in my hand a letter that the ministry has looked at that; it's going to suspend that and it will no longer be necessary in the interim. People in rural Ontario are very pleased with that.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Perhaps the minister could table a detailed reply.

**Mr Villeneuve:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Does this now mean Agriculture, Food, Rural Affairs and Septic Tanks?

**The Speaker:** That is not a point of order.

DE LA SALLE COLLEGE

**Mr Tony Rizzo (Oakwood):** My question is to the Minister of Education and Training. I would like to ask a question on behalf of parents and students who attend De La Salle College. As you are aware, the Brothers of the Christian Schools, owners of the school property, entered negotiations with the Metropolitan Separate School Board last October with the intention of converting De La Salle school back to a privately run institution. In February of this year negotiations broke down when the Brothers of the Christian Schools withdrew. To date, no further negotiations have taken place, and parents are naturally worried about their children's future.

Mr Minister, these parents are now faced with two possibilities, either having to pay exorbitant tuition fees so their children remain enrolled at De La Salle or having to transfer them to another school. This is not fair, and I wish to ask the minister, what action does the ministry plan to take to ensure that the students' education is not jeopardized?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I appreciate the question and I certainly appreciate the interest and involvement this member has had in this particular issue. I must say that on this issue I've been very disappointed right from the beginning that the brothers who own this particular school have decided to move in the direction of privatization when, as all of us know, it's not even 10 years ago that this Legislature made a major move in terms of extension of funding, and part of that obviously was that the existing schools would come into the public sector and the students would have the kind of accessibility that goes with that.

Unfortunately, the school is owned privately and therefore the ministry has its hands tied and can't do a lot about this. We are involved with the Metropolitan Separate School Board and are trying to facilitate negotiations. There have been some offers back and forth. We'll continue to try to work on this.

**Mr Rizzo:** Will the minister guarantee that the children currently enrolled in this institution will not be forced to transfer to another school because they now find themselves in a school that is no longer publicly funded?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** The fact is that if this school goes entirely private and there is no arrangement with the Metropolitan Separate School Board, then public funds cannot flow into a private school to pay a private tuition. That is a reality. There was an offer made by the Metropolitan Separate School Board to continue an arrangement



for the current students to completion of their high school that was rejected by the brothers. There is an effort being made by the separate school board, and neighbouring schools will attempt, to the best of their ability, to keep those—

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** Sit down. He just looked at the clock.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I'm not going to take a lecture from Jim Bradley about the length of answers. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

1450

#### JOB CREATION

**Mr Hugh P. O'Neil (Quinte):** Mr Speaker, I know question period has gone on for quite a while today, but I have a very important question—at least I feel it is a very important question—dealing with eastern Ontario and job creation. I would like to address it to the Treasurer.

Minister, yesterday in the Legislature our leader, Lyn McLeod, raised the issue of job losses with the Premier. Specifically she mentioned the Trenton-Belleville area, which has been very hard-hit with the loss of approximately 2,600 jobs, consisting of over 100 layoffs or closures during the past three years.

Some of the largest losses were Corby Distilleries, 180 people; Stewart-Warner, 60 people; Stouffers, 130 people; Murata Erie, from a high of 1,000 to a plant that is now empty; Freightmasters, 60 people; Paperboard Industries, 180 people; and the closing of the General Electric plant, affecting 160 workers.

Treasurer, I want to send these 16 pages of layoffs and closures that were provided to me by the UIC offices in Belleville and Trenton over to you and also to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

I want to add to that, which is part of my second question, that yesterday again the Premier mentioned action your government has taken for other areas hard-hit by high unemployment. Those were Kapuskasing, Sault Ste Marie and Thunder Bay. Also, yesterday the Minister of Economic Development and Trade announced a new \$24-million Windsor assistance package to create or maintain 1,495 jobs. You have mentioned other job creation areas you've created in the north and in the south.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question.

**Mr O'Neil:** What I'm asking is that none of these were in eastern Ontario. Where do the Quinte area especially, and eastern Ontario, stand in your jobs strategy for some type of special employment assistance? We are only asking for our fair share of job creation in eastern Ontario.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I wonder if I could refer that very important question to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** First, I want to address the point the member raised with respect to the assistance package to Windsor and the announcement that was made this

week. It's very important that he recall that our government made a decision, and announced it in the last budget, to cancel a number of relocations of government offices to communities across the province: Windsor, Chatham, Brantford, Kingston, the Haileybury/Tri-Town area and Elliot Lake.

We also announced at that time that we were setting aside a pool of money, \$100 million, to work with those affected communities to try to replace at least the same number of public sector jobs that weren't moving there with private sector jobs, and we've worked very hard to do that. We have had successful completion of packages in a number of communities.

Kingston was one of those communities. You referenced that there was no eastern Ontario involvement. There was also a portion of money that went to Renfrew as a result of the cancellation and the change in relocation there. With respect to that particular announcement and the treatment of Windsor, in fact all communities affected in the same way have been treated in the same way, so the member should put his question in the proper context.

He raises the serious question of job loss. It is a very serious issue right across the province. We've been working through the Ontario Development Corp with companies like Perth Soaps and others that have been brought to our attention, and we're working in eastern Ontario and in all parts of the province. I'd be pleased to sit down and look at the list you're providing and particular issues of assistance on which we can work with you, but I assure the member that our efforts have been, if not as intense, even more intense in parts of eastern Ontario, if you look down through Cornwall and other areas that have been tragically affected by the recession and the job loss that has affected not just this province but this whole country.

**The Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired.

#### APOLOGY

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** Yesterday during a vote, I made a comment with respect to the newly elected member for the third party that was intemperate, and for that comment, I withdraw it and apologize.

#### MOTIONS

##### COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that the following substitutions be made to the membership of the standing committees:

The standing committee on the administration of justice: Mr Bisson for Mr Duignan, and Ms Haeck for Mr Mills.

The standing committee on estimates: Mr Fletcher for Ms Haeck, and Mr Duignan for Mr Bisson.

The standing committee on general government: Mr Mills for Mr Fletcher.

The standing committee on government agencies: Mr Malkowski for Mr Marchese.

The standing committee on public accounts: Mr Marchese for Mr Duignan.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Mr Speaker, I would like to stand on a point of order and ask you if you could investigate whether the issues about the shortfall this year in the financing, some \$2 billion—there have been many reports in the newspapers with respect to a \$2-billion shortfall in revenues and the expenditures having to be cut.

**The Speaker:** What is the member's point of order?

**Mr Stockwell:** I would ask, through you, Mr Speaker, to the Treasurer, on a point of order, that I think this Legislature has a right to know exactly where we stand in our fiscal forecasts and financial positions.

**The Speaker:** The member has been here long enough to know that points of order are directed to the Speaker. The member has what sounds like very good subject material for question period, and we will have another question period tomorrow.

#### PETITIONS

##### PAY EQUITY

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** I have a petition that reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas the government of Ontario undertook to provide a down payment to female-dominated employees of community agencies funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services in anticipation of required increases in salary rates because of the proxy comparison method under the pay equity legislation; and

"Whereas there were a number of female-dominated agencies which had been approved for the proxy comparison method by the Pay Equity Commission but whose employees were not provided with the down payment in the original government process because of the criteria used; and

"Whereas approximately 90% of similar agencies funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services in Ontario have received the down payment, we as a female-dominated organization, along with a few other community agencies in the province, have not to date received the promissory down payment that was initiated in the summer of 1992; and

"Whereas we applaud this initiative in its attempt to assist women in low-paying jobs to bring their wages to a proportionate level of their male counterparts, and furthermore

"We request"—and this part is underlined—"that the government of Ontario fulfil its commitment to the female-dominated workforce in the province and equity by agreeing to provide the same down payment to the employees of those community agencies who have been approved for proxy comparison and who were not provided with that funding to date."

This was signed by several employees and supporters of the York South Association for Community Living who have been denied the same benefits that hundreds of others have been given. That has to be corrected and

that's the purpose of the petition.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have a petition and it reads as follows:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe there will be an enormous negative impact on our society over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined by the Ontario Human Rights Code and may include sadomasochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all such references should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

I support this petition. I've signed it.

##### PAY EQUITY

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I have a petition here to the government of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the government of Ontario undertook to provide a down payment to the female-dominated employees of community agencies funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services in anticipation of the required increases in salary rates because of the proxy comparison method under the pay equity legislation; and

"Whereas there were a large number of female-dominated agencies which have been approved for the proxy comparison method by the Pay Equity Commission but whose employees were not provided with the down payment in the original government process because of the criteria used; and

"Whereas 90% of similar agencies funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services in Ontario have received the down payment, we as a female-dominated organization, along with a few other community agencies in the province, have not to date received the promissory down payment that was initiated in the summer of 1992; and

"Whereas we applaud this initiative and its attempt to assist women in lower-paying jobs to bring their wages to a proportionate level of their male counterparts; and furthermore,

"We request that the government of Ontario fulfil its commitment to the female-dominated workforce in the province and equity by agreeing to provide the same down payment to the employees in these community



agencies who have been approved for proxy comparison and who have not been provided with that funding to date."

1500

"I, the undersigned," and there are many employees who have signed this, "am an employee of the York South Association for Community Living, 475 Edward Avenue, Richmond Hill, and feel a strong sense of injustice due to the fact that I was unfairly denied the pay equity down payment awarded by the government of Ontario to similar community agencies."

It's been signed by many employees. In fact, even those few male employees have signed this petition. They're here at a meeting with folks from the ministry to present their concerns directly, and some of the members of the opposition were there as well to deal with this inequity. I hope it gets dealt with in due course.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Thank you. Your point has been made.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Hugh P. O'Neil (Quinte):** I also have several petitions which I'd like to present. These petitions come from the riding of Quinte, as an example, from the Salvation Army, from many people in the Belleville, Sydney, Trenton and Frankford areas, and they concern Bills 45, 55, and 56. I submit these bills and add my signature in support of the petitions.

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas several patients from the New Tecumseth area are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas the current dialysis system is discriminatory because some patients have dialysis machines and are treated in home while others have to travel long distances to receive care, and one local patient is forced to pay for her own nurse;

"Whereas the government continues to insist they are studying the problem, even though they have known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in Alliston and Collingwood,

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of New Tecumseth."

That petition is signed by myself and a number of people who join a list of thousands of petitions I have received from both the amalgamated town of New Tecumseth, which contains the previous town of Alliston, and the Collingwood area.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** I have a

petition that was sent to the Lieutenant Governor. It's from Claire Marriott, and it's against Bill 45 because of its changing the meaning of the words "spouse" and "marital status." It's from residents of Hamilton Mountain.

#### GUN CONTROL

**Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and it reads:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Solicitor General allow a provincial exemption as provided for in federal law to possess and use high-capacity firearm magazines for the purpose of competitive shooting in Ontario."

I have signed my name to that as well.

#### PAY EQUITY

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I have a petition:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the government of Ontario undertook to provide a down payment to female-dominated employees of community agencies funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services in anticipation of required increases in the salary rates because of the proxy comparison method under the pay equity legislation; and

"Whereas there were a number of female-dominated agencies which have been approved for the proxy comparison method by the Pay Equity Commission but whose employees were not provided with the down payment in the original government process because of the criteria used; and

"Whereas approximately 90% of similar agencies funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services in Ontario have received the down payment, we, as a female-dominated organization, along with a few other community agencies in the province, have not to date received the promissory down payment that was initiated in the summer of 1992; and

"Whereas we applaud this initiative in its attempt to assist women in low-paying jobs to bring their wages to a proportionate level of their male counterparts; and furthermore,

"We request that the government of Ontario fulfil its commitment to the female-dominated workforce in the province and equity by agreeing to provide the same down payment to the employees in those community agencies who have been approved for proxy comparison and who were not provided with that funding to date.

"We, the undersigned employees of the York South Association for Community Living, feel a strong sense of injustice due to the fact that we were unfairly denied the pay equity down payment awarded by the government of Ontario to other similar community agency staff."

I affix my signature to this petition and submit it in the same way as Mr Sorbara and my friend Mr O'Connor have done.

#### ANIMALS FOR RESEARCH

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** I have a

petition addressed to the Parliament of Ontario that reads:

"Whereas every year in North America animals are used in cruel, outdated tests for cosmetics and household products; and

"Whereas these tests are not required by provincial or federal law; and

"Whereas many non-animal alternatives tests are available and are already in use by many companies,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario to pass into law a bill which prohibits the use of animals in cosmetic and household product testing."

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex South):** I have a petition signed by 109 constituents sent to me by Pastor John Bergman. It's addressed to the Honourable Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe such reference should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

In agreement, I affix my signature to this.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I have a petition which is sent to me by Pastor John Foster of the Evangel Temple in my riding and it reads:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and may include sadomasochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is

elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe such references should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

This has been signed by some 212 signatories, and to which I too attach my signature.

#### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** I have two petitions, one on behalf of the member for Scarborough West and of course one for Yorkview. It reads as follows:

"Whereas the British North America Act of 1867 supports the right of Catholic students to a Catholic education and the province of Ontario supports two educational systems from kindergarten to grade 12 OAC; and

"Whereas the Metropolitan Toronto School Board educates more than 103,000 students across Metropolitan Toronto; and

"Whereas this is equivalent to 30% of all the students in the area; and

"Whereas the Metropolitan Toronto School Board is expected to provide the same programs and services as its public school counterparts and must do so by receiving \$1,822 less for each elementary school student and \$2,542 less per secondary school student based on 1993 estimates,

"We, the undersigned"—and there's a few of them—"petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act now to ensure that Ontario's two principal education systems are funded fully and equally."

I support this 100%.

1510

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I was afraid I wasn't going to get this very important petition on the record. It is from 200 people from the Trenton trailer park and it's to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. We respectfully request that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario take action on the matter of Bill 21 to protect people living in mobile homes and living on leased land from being removed from their homes."

I've signed the petition.

#### LANDFILL

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition of 48 signatures addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the recent announcement by the NDP government to choose three superdumps within the greater Toronto area has disturbed and upset local residents; and

"Whereas these superdumps may have been prevented if Bill 143 had allowed the Interim Waste Authority to look at all alternatives during the site selection process; and

"Whereas we would like to ensure the province of



Ontario is making the best decision based on all of the facts regarding incineration and long rail-haul and garbage management;

"We demand that the NDP government of Ontario repeal Bill 143, disband the IWA and place a moratorium on the process of finding a landfill to serve all of the greater Toronto area until all alternatives can be properly studied and debated."

I have signed this petition.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mrs Marland from the standing committee on government agencies presented the committee's 13th through 16th reports, inclusive.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Do you wish to make a brief statement?

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** No, thank you. I do not have any comment.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to standing order 106(g)11, the reports are deemed to be adopted by the House.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TOWN OF BOTHWELL ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Hope, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr89, An Act respecting the Town of Bothwell.  
TOWNSHIP OF HURON AND  
VILLAGE OF RIPLEY ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Elston, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr78, An Act respecting the Township of Huron and the Village of Ripley.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT, 1994  
LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LES RELATIONS DE TRAVAIL

On motion by Mr Jim Wilson, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 142, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act /  
Projet de loi 142, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations de travail.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Do you wish to make a few statements?

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** Yes. The intention of the bill is to exempt new short-line railway line operators from the new provisions of the NDP's Bill 40 labour laws, which require that with federally incorporated companies selling to provincially incorporated companies, those new provincial companies would have to respect the successor rights of the employees of the former federal company.

The problem is acute in the Collingwood and Simcoe county areas, where 1,900 jobs are at stake if the government doesn't move to rectify the problem that it has created with its labour laws. I hope the government will eventually support this piece of legislation, which attempts, as I said, to rectify a very serious matter.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I just want to remind the

members that the statement must be brief.

The member for Scarborough Centre.

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** I move second reading of the Financial Services Statute Law Reform Amendment Act.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is that introduction of bills?

The member for Windsor-Sandwich.

CAPITOL THEATRE AND ARTS CENTRE  
(WINDSOR) ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Dadamo, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr71, An Act respecting the Capitol Theatre and Arts Centre (Windsor).

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON  
AND FRENCH-LANGUAGE SCHOOL BOARDS  
STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT DES LOIS  
CONCERNANT LA MUNICIPALITÉ RÉGIONALE  
D'OTTAWA-CARLETON ET LES CONSEILS SCOLAIRES  
DE LANGUE FRANÇAISE

On motion by Mr Philip, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 143, An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and to amend the Education Act in respect of French-Language School Boards /  
Projet de loi 143, Loi modifiant certaines lois relatives à la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et la Loi sur l'éducation en ce qui a trait aux conseils scolaires de langue française.

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Could the minister clarify? Does this now supersede Bill 77? Does he withdraw Bill 77? Is this the new bill here, or what are we dealing with?

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** That's not a point of order.

Minister, do you wish to make a brief statement?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** I wish to reintroduce for first reading a bill that will reform local government in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

As members may recall, I introduced a similar bill last session which was designed to give a greater regional focus to the area's governance arrangements. It proposed that regional council be directly elected, that mayors of local municipalities not be on regional council, that the region be given responsibility for policing services and that it be given a new and stronger role in economic development. The changes in the electoral process were to be in effect for 1994 municipal elections.

The bill I'm introducing today retains all of these provisions and incorporates several new provisions as well. Some of these are necessary because of the delay in passing this bill. The Ontario Municipal Board will be given authority to make changes in the electoral areas of wards of school boards as a result of changes to local, municipal and regional wards.

The bill includes several police-related measures: the establishment of a regional police planning committee and a regional police services board, clarification of the

region's authority to phase in any changes in costs for policing, and the extension of the date for amalgamation of the three existing police forces until January 1, 1997.

As well, street vending provisions have been corrected and provisions have been added which will ensure that the 1994 municipal and school board elections run smoothly.

Finally, the bill is being changed to deal with the operation of Ottawa-Carleton's French-language school board. There has been extensive consultation in the Ottawa-Carleton area, including three studies in the past five years. The time for action has come, and I urge all honourable members to support fast passage of the bill.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you. Your statement has been made.

1520

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In relation to whether or not this bill can be introduced, I think we would have a better understanding of whether or not it complies with the standing orders by not mirroring another existing bill if the Minister of Municipal Affairs would have told us that this also was an act of administration which would withdraw the existing bill, which does virtually the same thing with the exception of the addition of some items around school boards.

It is very well known here that the standing orders do not allow the introduction of two bills to the same purpose at the same time in this Legislative Assembly. I think the minister must now tell us if he is going to withdraw Bill 77. In fact, if Bill 77 is not immediately withdrawn, this bill must be refused acceptance on the floor of this House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I'm sorry to say, but this is not a point of order.

**Mr Daigeler:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: You have not asked for a vote on this matter.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I just mentioned that it was not a point of order.

**Mr Daigeler:** That's correct, but you have not asked for a vote on this first reading of the bill.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Yes, I did.

CITY OF HAMILTON ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Abel, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

CITY OF KINGSTON ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Gary Wilson, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr91, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### FINANCIAL SERVICES

STATUTE LAW REFORM AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993 PORTANT RÉFORME DE DIVERSES LOIS  
RELATIVES AUX SERVICES FINANCIERS

Mr Owens, on behalf of Mr Laughren, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 134, An Act to revise the Credit Unions and

Caisses Populaires Act and to amend certain other Acts relating to financial services / *Projet de loi 134, Loi révisant la Loi sur les caisses populaires et les credit unions et modifiant d'autres lois relatives aux services financiers.*

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** I'm very pleased today to move that Bill 134, the Financial Services Statute Law Reform Amendment Act, be given second reading, as you can tell by my exuberance earlier in standing up to move this particular bill.

As members of this House will know, this financial services reform bill was introduced by the Minister of Finance in December 1993. It sets out important and forward-looking reforms for the credit unions and caisses populaires in the Insurance Act and the Securities Act.

The reforms in Bill 134 reflect this government's commitment to modernize the regulation of financial services in Ontario. Our clear direction is to remove outdated and unnecessary barriers to capital for Ontario businesses and Ontario entrepreneurs; to provide the lending and investment tools needed to support economic development in communities across the province; to strengthen the ability of Ontario's financial institutions to compete in the marketplace so Ontario businesses and Ontario residents can have a strong alternative to the banks when they need sources of financing; and finally, to ensure that in all we do, Ontario consumers are well protected in an increasingly complex and dynamic financial services environment.

We made clear, when the minister introduced Bill 134, that it was the first step in this modernization process, and what a significant step it is.

The first and largest part of Bill 134 is the package with respect to comprehensive reforms to the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act. These reforms are the result of more than two years of consultation and close collaboration with the credit union and caisse populaire movement and with the financial services sector as a whole.

Beginning in 1991, the credit unions and caisses populaires formed the legislative reform committee to make recommendations to the government. The consultation continues today and the different parts of the movement have come together to form a new coalition and a dynamic working group to work through some of the issues that have arisen. This industry consistently demonstrated its ability to rise above its internal differences to identify common goals and objectives and worked with the government in a professional, businesslike way to make reform a reality.

The credit union and caisse populaire movement is the smallest of the "pillars" which make up the financial services sector in Ontario. It has operated for nearly 20 years with legislation that limited its business powers, limited its lending powers, limited its ability to attract capital for growth and development and imposed a regulatory regime where government approval was required for many day-to-day operations.

In the face of these restrictions, credit unions and caisses populaires have continued to serve their commun-



ities well. This industry consistently rates high in consumer polls in areas of quality, quality of service, accessibility and innovation, and in the face of these restrictions, this industry has never stopped supporting local economic development in communities across Ontario.

But the environment in which credit unions and caisses populaires operate has changed dramatically and the statutory limitations which they face have now become serious obstacles to progress. The marketplace has become more complex and more competitive. Many other financial institutions with whom credit unions must compete on a daily basis have been given modern business powers and a much broader scope in offering financial services and are moving ahead rapidly.

In the economy as a whole, the recession has taken a serious toll on Ontario businesses and the lives of Ontario residents. Now, as never before, we need to ensure that local job creation initiatives have a ready and adequate source of financing and that communities have the tools to help themselves.

Through Bill 134, the government has responded to these challenges in a number of ways. First, we are providing specific tools to strengthen the movement's traditional role of supporting economic development in their communities. Second, we are providing credit unions and caisses populaires with the business powers they need to remain profitable and competitive and to provide Ontarians with a real choice in the financial services marketplace. Third, we are ensuring that our rules are made more effective and are more carefully targeted to areas of risk within the system. Finally, we are establishing a modern consumer protection measures process within the credit union system.

After a wait of nearly two decades, the credit union and caisse populaire movement will have an array of modern financial services, powers and tools at their disposal. Unlike the current system, which limits credit unions to the specific activities listed in the statute, Bill 134 provides credit unions with broad-based, general powers to conduct the business of the financial services.

Where the current statute imposes restrictive caps on commercial lending and then limits these caps even further by lumping together agricultural lending with commercial lending, Bill 134 provides an expanded and more flexible framework for business lending. Caps will be raised on both agricultural and commercial lending, and, through a new lending licence system, credit unions will be able to expand their lending activity as their operations expand. Credit unions and caisses populaires will be able to syndicate loans; that is, band together to support larger-scale commercial lending.

1530

Nearly \$1.5 billion is now in the system but is restrained by existing rules. This \$1.5 billion will be made available for new loans and investments. Credit unions and caisses populaires will be given a much broader ability to own subsidiaries. This will enable them to offer a wide range of specialty services to their members, to enter profitable lines of financial services and to undertake specialized forms of community development activities.

The movement has made clear to the government that access to capital is of critical importance. Without capital, credit unions cannot grow, innovate, fully utilize technology or support community development. Bill 134 provides the movement with new options for raising capital, including tapping into the public equity markets in addition to the traditional sources. At the same time, however, we have taken care to ensure that the cooperative, "one member, one vote" character of the movement is preserved.

Innovative and flexible marketing arrangements are increasingly common among financial institutions. These are becoming more important sources of revenue. Bill 134 allows credit unions and caisses populaires to sell the products of other financial institutions and so be able to increase the range of profitable services they can offer to their membership.

I would like to note here that the government has taken particular care in crafting the sections of Bill 134 relating to insurance retailing. It's important that we do not disrupt the marketplace standards that have been established under federal legislation. I'm pleased to state that we have worked very, very closely and, most importantly, successfully with the credit union movement and the insurance industry on this matter.

As members of the House will know, each credit union and caisse populaire is formed around the bond of association, individuals sharing a common bond joined together on a cooperative basis to help each other address their financial needs. Because the population and the industrial bases are changing in Ontario, credit unions need greater flexibility in expanding or adjusting their bonds of association. Our reforms will allow for a percentage of the total membership to include business corporations and governmental bodies. These bodies currently fall outside the bond.

As we modernize the range of powers available to credit unions, we must also take care to ensure that the regulatory system keeps pace. A modern regulatory system must be effective but must not impose unnecessary burdens on the industry. A modern regulatory system must clearly allocate responsibility between the government and the industry. A modern regulatory system must be able to spot problems and move to correct them before they grow to serious proportions.

In Bill 134, we have established a regulatory system which satisfies all these criteria:

—We have strengthened the movement's responsibilities for managing its own affairs, and we have established the requirement for audit committees and new eligibility requirements for boards of directors.

—We have strengthened disclosure requirements for potential conflicts of interest.

—We have established a system-wide monitoring program to enable the deposit insurer and the credit unions and caisses populaires themselves to identify and correct emerging problems.

—We have made the regulator's powers more focused and more directed towards potential problem areas in the system, rather than waiting until a problem has blown up.

Finally, as I noted, in all we do and in all of our reforms, we must never forget the need to ensure that the consumer of financial services in Ontario is protected. We have taken important steps directly with Bill 134, and we have provided the legislative framework to take further steps as marketplace conditions continue to evolve.

We have, for instance, required credit unions to disclose to members what products and services are covered by deposit insurance, and to what dollar amount. We have prohibited tied selling, where the purchase of one product is made conditional on the purchase of another product. We have required credit unions to disclose the terms and conditions on arrangements to sell the products of other financial institutions. And we have provided new powers to make regulations on consumer protection issues, including enhanced disclosure to consumers, the use of confidential consumer information and acceptable marketing practices.

When the Minister of Finance introduced Bill 134 last December, he said, "These reforms will begin a new era for Ontario's credit unions and caisses populaires and their communities." The minister was speaking of the specific provisions of Bill 134. I would add that the process of reform and the strong and growing spirit of cooperation within the movement itself also mark a new and exciting era for the credit unions and caisses populaires in Ontario.

On the issue of life agent reform, in the second part of this bill we are updating the Insurance Act. We want to modernize how Ontario regulates life insurance agents. This will make the financial services sector more competitive and better protect those who buy life insurance.

This framework will allow us to introduce higher educational standards and two levels of licences, and to establish a strict code of ethics and set out serious penalties for violating it.

It will also broaden agents' ability to offer the products of other insurance companies to better provide for the diverse needs of consumers. Let me provide some details on this.

The amendments will provide a regulation-making power to permit the introduction of a two-step examination and licensing system. All applicants for licensing would be required to pass an entry-level examination to be followed two years later by a more comprehensive examination.

It will broaden the ability of experienced life insurance agents to better sell the products of more than one life insurer, so consumers have a choice of products at the point of purchase. It will provide increased protection for consumers through the power to make regulations prescribing an agents' code of ethics.

It will introduce regulation-making power to govern networking arrangements between insurance companies, agents, brokers and other businesses or financial institutions.

It will provide for authority for an organization, a life insurance council composed of people from the life insurance industry and representatives of the public, to

license and regulate life insurance agents.

It will require that licences of life insurance agents be renewed once every two years on their birthday rather than the current requirement of annually on a single day.

Most of the new proposals will be put into place by amending regulations. We will consult with interested parties on how to change these regulations.

The life agent reforms in Bill 134 are necessary to keep the sector vital and able to contribute to the province's economic renewal.

On the issue of securities, the third part of the bill, again we are in the process of strengthening protection for investors in securities. These measures will further enhance confidence in Ontario's markets as a safe place to invest.

Bill 134 amends the Securities Act to update the Ontario Securities Commission's powers to investigate alleged misconduct and to deal with misconduct when it's found.

To make monitoring the conduct of participants more efficient and effective, we will also extend the OSC's authority to recognize and oversee self-regulatory organizations.

The financial services sector plays an important part in Ontario's economy. It is a major employer that provides thousands of jobs. It also provides services to individuals and families, and supports businesses.

Modernizing the rules for the financial services in Bill 134 reflects this government's commitment to a strong and competitive financial services sector needed to contribute to Ontario's economic growth.

With that, I'd like to thank the members of the credit union and caisse populaire movement, the members of the securities community and also the members of the life agent community for their hard work and their continued support of the government in its move to keep Ontario's economy strong and to promote the strong financial services sector that we have in this province.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Questions or comments?

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I was very interested to listen to the remarks. Basically, they reflect in a little broader terms what was said by the minister when he introduced this on December 9.

It would be interesting to have the parliamentary assistant tell us about the omissions from the bill. It would be interesting, when he talks about an all-encompassing financial services reform, if he would tell us why they have chosen as a government not to include other players like mutual insurance companies and trust companies that are also interested in playing on the same level playing field that they seem to be creating under the auspices of this bill.

I am also interested in whether they are willing to entertain amendments to this bill that would allow that level playing field to be established. Perhaps he can explain to us why he has omitted to address those particular areas, and that might give us some insight about why the bill takes its current form.



Finally, it would be interesting to have the parliamentary assistant explain to us why there could not be three separate pieces of legislation so that this Legislative Assembly can keep each particular element of the financial services package separate and so that we can study in some detail and with some specifics each particular area without having to run from one item into another.

We do run into the prospect of causing some confusion around the legislation, as we have caused in relation to the passage of Bills 108, 109 and 110 in a previous sitting in this House. Those bills, having been dealt with together under an agreement by this House, ultimately ended up causing widespread public confusion around what was intended by the government with respect to the Powers of Attorney Act. It seems to me that we should be very wary indeed of establishing any legislative agenda that causes that sort of public confusion.

1540

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I share in the comments presented by the member of the Liberal Party, but I would like to go further. His points are all valid.

One thing that concerns me is that the Ministry of Financial Institutions on October 29, 1992, issued a news release, which I have a copy of here, that announced, "Sweeping review of Ontario financial services regulation announced," and then went on to talk about the importance of the financial sector, with which we would all agree, I'm sure. But then it says:

"While the review will concentrate on much-needed reforms to the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act, the Insurance Act and the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, Mr Charlton stressed that all interested parties are encouraged to identify other areas and issues for consideration."

Well, what you've brought forward is the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act, and you're making changes to the Insurance Act through this, but there's been nothing on the Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

That was back on October 29, 1992, that your government indicated you were beginning the study. I have to admit with some pleasure that there is a sense in which your government has communicated with different groups with regard to issues in the credit unions and the life insurance industry and the insurance industry. And there are major issues, because when you're dealing with a bill that's 185 pages long, this is no simple act; there's an awful lot to it.

I really would like to ask you why the government has not dealt with the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, and in your response, if you'd indicate what your timetable is in dealing with that. The expectation was that it would be covered, but certainly it has not been, either in your remarks or in the bill. If you could deal with that, I would be very grateful.

**Mr Owens:** I'd like to thank the members for Bruce and Markham for their comments in terms of the issues with respect to—I imagine the member for Bruce is addressing the issue with respect to farm mutuals and the issue with respect to the loan and trust act.

The government is clearly dedicated to the proposition that these pieces of legislation will be brought forward. I take it, and I hope by your generous comments and questions with respect to these two issues in particular that I'm hearing, that this particular bill and the others would proceed with very little opposition.

In terms of the timetable the member for Markham has asked for, we are still working out some issues with respect to the loan and trust industry. It's our view, as I indicated in my remarks, that the financial services industry is very important to this province, and we want to make sure that things are done right, done cooperatively and done with a sense of building on a strong foundation. I certainly hope we can finish up the work quickly, and as I say, the generous remarks by both members indicate that there will be warm support in the House for these pieces of legislation.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Are there any other members who wish to participate in this debate? The member for Bruce.

**Mr Elston:** To the honourable member for Scarborough Centre, my interest in the issues of loan and trust and interest in the Insurance Act and in the mutual insurance businesses is real and genuine, but the support for any draft legislation or legislation at all will depend on what he and his minister friend and others intend to put in that legislation.

I think that, interestingly enough, this is not a bad bill to start a new session with. This perhaps will set a tone that will allow us to be fairly cooperative in dealing with some of the legislative agenda of the New Democratic Party because we see this as a step forward; not a step that is taken without some problems, in our view. It is not, however, a piece of legislation where problems in it are serious enough in nature for us to cause any delay in any way, shape or form, and when the vote is taken in principle, our caucus will be supporting this particular legislation.

Having said that, I do want to repeat in the context of my own remarks, as opposed to replying or at least asking questions on the remarks of the member for Scarborough Centre, that we are concerned about the government's propensity now to include in one large bill several pieces of legislative initiative in the manner that this one is constructed. I don't think it is fair to the credit unions, I don't think it's fair to the life people nor do I think it's fair to the securities industry that they all be wrapped together, because in each of these very special and specialized segments, there are very interesting issues of principle around each of those items.

The principles involved in the securities legislative amendments and those principles involved with the credit unions are considerably different in many ways because they deal with functions which are separate in very many ways. If you cast your eyes on this piece of legislation, on this omnibus legislation, it is very difficult to get a single principle out of it that binds it all together with the exception that it all deals with some aspect of financial services.

That should mean, by the way, that in the context of committee deliberations, which have been agreed to by

the member for Hamilton Mountain at the request of both myself and the member for Markham, there should be a very wide leeway and latitude given to us when we introduce amendments to this bill that deal with financial services in the province, because the only principle I can see running straight through this particular bill is that it deals with some financial services in the province of Ontario. So if we move amendments which deal with others, those should be just as acceptable to the government as any other or, at least, they should be acceptable to the Chair so the debate can be had around making sure that the even playing field with respect to provision of financial services is indeed established throughout the financial services market.

I am interested in looking at the run-up to the legislation and its deployment here in the form of Bill 134. There's no question that these initiatives didn't start just two years ago. In fact, when I was Minister of Financial Institutions there were discussions about the revision of the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act because, of course, that was important to the caisses populaires and the credit unions and has been for some time.

One of the difficulties that was with us in those days was the fact that there were significant difficulties from a financial stability point of view with some of the credit unions and some of the caisses populaires. I think we should stop for a moment right here and indicate that the very difficult circumstances around the early 1980s situations with some of the credit unions and caisses populaires have to a large extent been dealt with. There are some, I think, that have to be acknowledged that exist even now with respect to some of the caisses populaires and some of the credit unions, although I must say here as well that I think the reservoir of difficulties probably is more associated with some of the credit union members as opposed to the caisses populaires.

Alliance and Fédération, it seems to me, have probably got all of their members on board. At least, that was the report I have received in the sense that they are all fairly stable. If I'm in error, the member for Scarborough Centre can correct me or some of the people who are off in the wings can send me a note via the mails at some other time and say, "X, Y and Z caisse populaire or the credit union here or there is not stable," but generally speaking, there has been a marvellous advance with respect to stabilizing some of those financial circumstances.

1550

I would like to see, by the way, when the member for Scarborough Centre has a chance to respond to my remarks, that he would undertake to table with us as critics the current status of the caisses populaires and the credit unions so that we can be absolutely sure that the plans to renovate their financial circumstances have all been carried out to the satisfaction of the ministry of financial institutions and to the satisfaction of the Minister of Finance, so that we are absolutely certain that these new initiatives which they are going to be allowed to undertake with respect to lending and other things—and raising money, as far as that goes—will be done on a very steady and stable financial basis indeed.

I think that probably is one of the very necessary first pieces of business when we go to the committee. It's actually a credit to the member for Hamilton Mountain, who has agreed with us that we should go to committee briefly during this session, that he has recognized that we need to have that information right up front, right at the beginning; the status of the movement, the status of the credit unions, the status of the caisses populaires, made very plain so that there will be no harm rendered to any of the members of the current movement with regard to putting in place new financial services.

I'm pleased to see that there has been apparently an endorsement of the current circumstances of the credit unions and caisses populaires in the province of Ontario by the minister and by the parliamentary assistant. It seems to me that this legislation indicates a Good House-keeping Seal of Approval. To me, it looks like there has been a reward for the renovation of any difficult financial circumstances in the credit union movement. I will take that as a given with respect to the balance of my remarks, because it is in my view necessary for us to allow an even playing field for these people to carry out their business, just as it is necessary for all other institutions to be able to compete on that same level playing field in the Ontario market.

I agree with the member for Scarborough Centre that it is important to have that level playing field. I agree with him that these are initiatives that will allow that to occur. I do have to differ with him just a wee bit though with regard to whether or not the ability for the credit unions to sell insurance is mirrored on that which is given to the banks under the federal legislation. It seems to me that they have reversed the legislative provisions. I think in the federal provisions, the banks cannot sell insurance unless there are some circumstances met, the regulations allow it. Here the legislation reads, "Credit unions and caisses populaires can sell insurance except...." So the two sections, it seems to me, indicate a very real difference of opinion as to how best to regulate the expansion of the sale of insurance.

Perhaps the member for Scarborough Centre can tell us about the differences of opinion between his ministry and those in the federal jurisdiction and the reasons why the provision is different. In fact, if that is discussed for us with some degree of detail, perhaps that will allow some of the people who remain concerned about these particular amendments as being proposed to understand their background and perhaps it will remove some of the concern that has been expressed to us by those people who have not been included in the legislation which has been held out as an example of levelling the playing field.

I am interested in the politics associated with this particular piece of legislation.

**Mr Cousens:** That's something you know a lot about.

**Mr Elston:** Mr Cousens, my friend from Markham, identifies the fact that I know something about politics. That of course is flattering, because I'm usually accused of not knowing much of anything about very much. Don, you're very flattering today and I'm sure I will reciprocate when your turn to speak arrives.



There's a holding out, in the amendments that are proposed for the caisses populaires and credit unions by the government, that these will allow new community development, new community initiatives, new farm initiatives, new funding for those local developments, which many of the communities that I happen to represent would be happy to see taking place.

The politics around this is that, I believe, the amendments proposed here will form the backdrop for a big release which will include in it the change of name of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, will include the credit union advancement of powers, will include the program where you can deposit money locally and have it guaranteed by the province—I've forgotten what the government's name for it is—where local money can be used and pooled and reloaned through credit unions.

**Mr Owens:** The community loan fund.

**Mr Elston:** The community loan fund, if that's what it's called. I accede to superior knowledge by the member for Scarborough Centre.

All of those will be packaged to produce some kind of a fog that makes people think that the New Democrats in this government are concerned about rural, or at least non-large-urban, Ontario, that they are concerned about all of those places outside Toronto and outside Ottawa, the smaller communities of the province, about their development.

But what is so interesting about that is that while they establish the programs and while the trappings are all around, the New Democratic Party government will probably very easily forget to talk about the amount of money that it has cut back with respect to agricultural funding in Ontario.

They will forget to talk about the cutbacks that they have produced which are causing severe jeopardy for conservation authorities and thereby the holding or retention of sensitive lands in the rural and outlying areas of this province. In fact, in my area the conservation authorities are thinking of selling land to pay the taxes which are now accruing on their publicly held properties, and the government is holding firm and cutting back, to change the way our landscape looks.

They will probably also forget to talk about the Sewell report when they come out to rural or non-large-urban Ontario. I said this is going to be part of a package and it will include these items—Mr Speaker, I don't understand what is wrong with what I'm saying.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Okay, continue.

**Mr Elston:** Thank you very much. To start to get back to where my thoughts were, I believe this will form part of a package that says they're concerned about rural Ontario, that OMAF and its renaming and a series of other initiatives—the community loan program and others—will be packaged so that they can say they're concerned. But they will forget to talk about the Sewell report. The Sewell report is one of those plans, if implemented, which would probably extract almost all of the ability of the local people to take any part in active development out in the hinterland.

I was pleased to hear today in the House, actually, that the Minister of Agriculture and Food—and he chose his words very carefully—was able to tell us that part of his duties were going to be to assert the rural interest with respect to certain government programs. He produced a letter from the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations that said that they were going to—and this is where he was very careful—"suspend" the operation of a government policy which prevented the development of public housing with septic tanks. I thought that was a very interesting choice of words. It is being "suspended"; it's not being withdrawn. In fact, in so many areas outside of Metro Toronto the whole issue around septic tanks, which was raised by Mr Sewell and which has caused a whole series of problems up my way and around the general vicinity, has really told rural Ontario that they won't be able to develop.

It is very interesting because it may very well be that the credit unions or the caisses populaires, when they come to looking at a request by some local entrepreneur, some woman or man who believes that they have a new business idea that is worth being supported, will be stymied by the very report that I've just mentioned; that is, the Sewell report. They will be precluded from developing their small business idea and the development of their real estate in a way which will promote their businesses. As a result, the credit unions, although they have the authority, will be stymied by the veto of the Sewell report's implementation.

That's a very important issue for me and that is why I've included some of those other items that seem to contradict what this item was set up to determine, because, you see, it doesn't matter if the credit unions have the authority to make the loans if some other government department has a policy which precludes the development taking place.

1600

In the end, the government of Ontario will have to make a decision about whether or not all the local abilities which are being given under this act to the credit unions when they make loans to entrepreneurs, whether they be farm entrepreneurs or agricultural business related, or whether they end up being primary resource people up in the Cochrane North area or anyplace around the province—they will have to decide that perhaps they will also have to let the local authorities decide that they should allow a development to occur.

If I go and the credit union says, "Good," but the Ministry of Municipal Affairs says, "Bad," or if the Ministry of Natural Resources says, "Bad," then this extension of powers to the credit unions and caisses populaires will not be of any assistance whatsoever to the promotion of the local economies. So we have to be very, very careful that we don't oversimplify the effects of this particular piece of legislation unless the government is willing to tell us that it is prepared to go all the way with this local authority and local decision-making.

I think it's interesting as well, and this is a very interesting part of the politics around this legislation, that it isn't purely, in my view, just to give the credit unions and caisses populaires some extra abilities; it is the

answer, when the New Democrats go out, to taking on the banks. It's a very popular activity these days. I think there are all kinds of members here from all parties—I have seen some circumstances where some local people in my area have, I think, had to face some unreal requests for securities from the chartered banks. While that is an issue which we have all struggled with, at least for the time I've been here, and I've been here for 13 years—

**Mr Cousens:** No.

**Mr Elston:** Well, the same length of time as the member from Markham, who just groaned, under some impression that he was not languishing with the same clock I was.

The issue of the banks is never going to cease, but here I think the New Democrats are going to say that the credit unions and caisses populaires are their answer to the banks' failure, as expressed by some, to promote small business or to stay firm as part of the supplier of capital to the farming or agricultural market or supplying capital to the primary resource base. For me, that doesn't provide the whole answer, although it does provide those people with a very interesting short answer for anybody who criticises them for not taking on the banks.

There are several other items of politics which are attached to this, and I can tell you that I'm sympathetic to seeing the credit unions and caisses populaires grow and be able to handle more business affairs. But I really have to be very concerned about their use as pawns in their next election, because that is going to be how the New Democrats try and market themselves as individuals of the people. I really see that starting to come about as I look at the releases. I have watched this very, very carefully and I know the politics that are being played with it.

I've been at a couple of speeches by a couple of the backbenchers who get sent out with the form notes, you know? I've seen them. What you do is that when you go out, you have a whole series of notes that the government informationites prepare for you, and when you go to your market, you put the asterisks beside the points that you want to mention where you're speaking. I've seen a couple of guys do this. Actually, they are guys, both men, I happened to be watching. There haven't been any speeches otherwise, but I was watching how they've packaged this, and it's a very interesting and very subtle piece of work that they're performing. They're using this and their community loans program as part of a demonstration that "We, the New Democrats, really care."

I don't think the New Democrats care any more for local development and local initiative and a movement of the economy of our locales than a Tory does or a Grit does. To be quite honest, we all want this economy to move.

**Mr Owens:** Come on Murray, read the Hansard on Algoma and Kapuskasing.

**Hon Shelley Martel (Minister of Northern Development and Mines):** Where were you guys?

**Mr Elston:** Oh, I woke somebody up. It's very interesting, the member who represents Northern Development has finally awakened. I hadn't heard about her

since she was talking to doctors, but my God, she's awake now and she's piping up. She is really piping up and I'm happy to see that she has finally come back to start participating again because, you know something, this is very interesting. My locale, Tobermory, was interested in what was going on with the ferry that moves between Tobermory and Manitoulin Island. They invited me to go to a meeting and we were all invited to go to a meeting, both myself and Mike Brown, the member for Algoma-Manitoulin. And you know what happened? You won't believe this.

**Mr Cousens:** Tell us what happened, Murray.

**Mr Elston:** You won't believe this either. Did you know, Ms Martel's office called and told the people who were going to the meeting that if they bring Elston and Brown, the minister will cancel the meeting.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** No.

**Mr Elston:** And you know what it was about? It was about economic development and economic opportunities for Manitoulin and Tobermory and that minister, Ms Martel, directed her people to tell the members, Brown and Elston, not to come. That's the type of local interest that she has. But just let her carry on and listen to a few more remarks. Perhaps she'll go back to sleep again.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Could you relate this to Bill 134, please.

**Mr Elston:** Oh, sure. We were talking about some local development opportunities, which of course are allowed under this legislation, but I'll tell you what the government does. What they do and what they say they're doing under this is belied by their actions out in the public and the types of activities that those people would have yelled and screamed about when they were in opposition. Of course, they're in power. They are in power and they are asserting power in a way it has never been before. It is very interesting to know that the world is changing and that the New Democrats are going to help it change.

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** And the Liberals are finally catching up with that reality.

**Mr Elston:** Another one woke up. The member for Oxford is back. He too was away for quite a little while. It's nice to see him home again on his perch where he's able to tell us what is right for the locale. I saw him vote on matters which were not liked very much in Oxford. I can tell him I've been in Oxford riding a few times and there are some people who are very concerned about your activities, just to let you know. I'm glad you woke up in time for me to recognize that you were here. We will come back—

**Mr Sutherland:** Tell them to come see me.

**Mr Elston:** They can't see you. You're hardly ever there.

**Mr Sutherland:** Baloney.

**Mr Elston:** The member for Oxford is an interesting guy. He probably has some credit unions in his area—

**The Acting Speaker:** I would really like to hear what you have to say about the bill.

**Mr Elston:** —but I want him to tell us whether or not



he will be speaking on this legislation to tell me how he is going to allow his local credit unions to get around all the interference that will be occurring from the ministries of Natural Resources or Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs or any of those with respect to some of these local developments.

It seems to me that he will be able when his turn comes to stand up and deliver that speech and explain how this legislation is going to work, but I suspect, if the pattern stays, that very few of the New Democrats will actually stand up and talk about this legislation because they've been told not to, because they may say something that will ruin the political package that is going to be put around this.

In any event, I am not going to go on at length. I'm not going to go on for the whole hour and a half in any event; I will go on for a little bit longer. But I do want to raise a couple of other issues with respect to the credit unions and caisses populaires.

1610

The concern I have, and it has been expressed to us, is that the powers that are given under this legislation will put some of the members of the credit union movement and some of the caisses populaires at a distinct disadvantage with some of their larger compatriots in the movements. In fact, there has been some expression of real concern by the small organizations because there's quite a variation among the organizations in the credit union and caisse populaire movements.

There is a real concern that the disadvantage now will not be between credit unions and trust companies or credit unions and insurance sales or credit unions and banks in terms of providing the service, but that there will be a very big disadvantage, among internal members, in the same movement. I started off by asking that the ministry explain to us the current status of all of the caisses populaires and credit unions with respect to their financial stability. There is a concern, among some of those small organizations that are stable but which are not large enough to cushion a broad expansion, that they will have to in fact help support some organizations which perhaps take this expansion of financial ability too far.

I think it is a reasonable concern to have expressed to us. I can understand it, because the credit union movement has not been easily established and achieved by the membership in this province. It has been a struggle for some organizations. I have marvelled at some of the local organizations and their tenacity in not only establishing but maintaining the credit union strength in a small pocket, because the credit unions really do exactly as the member for Scarborough Centre indicated: They do occupy areas which were not occupied by other financial institutions.

The people did come together, with some degree of difficulty, and they've held themselves together. There is a real concern among those people who are small in size that either (1) they may in fact be pushed to a point which removes the stability of their organization by providing more services, or (2) if they do resist the movement, they may be asked to pool to help cover the problems associated with someone who has not been as

successful in maintaining his financial stability.

I don't raise this as an issue which should be used to veto the bill or prevent it from moving further, but I do raise it as a valid concern about where the credit union movement is going and the degree of concern that has been expressed to me by some of those smaller organizations which are, because of their size, not as able to withstand some financial difficulties.

I'd also like to raise an issue which is my own favourite pet with regard to credit unions and caisses populaires, and that is the philosophy behind their beginnings. The whole idea, of course, cooperative movement and otherwise, was that you're all members and you come together and you win by participating together. You're advantaged by participating together. Here in this legislation we are introducing a change to that, and the issue of how you raise capital, if you don't change that, I guess is a real one for me, but I still have to ask the question: If you are going to issue stocks—and that's what is being issued, or allowed to be issued under this legislation—does that mean that you are still a credit union or does that mean that you are still a caisse populaire?

I can buy a preference stock in a trust company or I can buy a preference share in a bank. I can now buy or I will be able to buy soon a non-voting share in the credit unions. My question becomes, if I can do that with all of them, is there any difference? Is there any difference whatsoever as among the various types of financial institutions which we have in the province? I think generally the answer is yes, but it may depend on the size of the institution more than anything else and it may depend on the style of management that is associated with each of the caisses populaires or the credit unions.

I am concerned that in some circumstances the issuance of stocks will mean that there will be the prospect of someone with a lot of money coming in and virtually taking over the operation of a credit union because they have so much of a financial stake in it, not because they necessarily are a member, although for a dollar they could be a member as well with one vote, but they would really force the operation of the credit union or caisse populaire to change, not because the membership democratically voted it to change but because the authority of the dollars invested by one or two people could force the credit union to take the steps that one or two people want them to, because if you take the money out there would be very big problems indeed for the credit union.

I am concerned about that, and I have raised it with the credit union people who have come to speak with me. They are not as concerned about it because their overriding need at this point is to expand their ability to attract finances. They want to expand, or at least the people who've talked to me more often than others, want to expand the financial services they have to offer. It's one of those very interesting points in the development of credit unions, like other organizations, where you have to make a very gut-wrenching decision about how your organization moves. You come to a point where you have to decide, "We're going to take this road or that road."

In some ways, this is a watershed for the development

of credit unions and caisses populaires in the province of Ontario, and that more than anything else is what is driving the concern among some of the smaller organizations, because perhaps they are not there with some of their larger compatriots in the movement, that they feel they may be forced to make a decision before they are ready to make a decision. That spells a degree of uncertainty in the organization which could be bad for the general membership. That is a concern to me, and during our committee hearings we will probably hear a little bit about that.

More than anything else, what I want is to have the ministry assure us that there is in place some plan to assist in making sure there is genuine stability in the movement for those people.

I should raise here just briefly another concern that's been raised, and it has been an issue of long-standing nature; that is, the concerns raised by the people at OSDIC, who are of course likewise concerned with financial stability. In fact, it's their mandate to make sure they are there to step in when financial security is lost. As a regulator or as a guarantor they have to be very wary, in fact, of the pressures that are put on credit unions or caisses populaires and they have to be very concerned that the membership is protected. I think it is right for us to be going into committee to hear about some of the background concerns and then be given some sense of the steps the government is taking to ensure that stability reigns in the caisse populaire and credit union movement.

I'm taken very much with a sense of—"security" perhaps isn't quite the right word, but a bit of a sense of security that these questions are out there and that the people who are responsible are genuinely asking for some direction with regard to these, or at least that they want to provide us with some information which may help us to ask the government to provide us with direction of how it is going to ensure that there are not going to be failures if some of the organizations go too far in some of their financial dealings. I feel very good about that, because those issues coming to our committee is what the legislative process is all about, and having the public aware that those concerns are out there is what this forum is all about, and that's why I raise them in the manner I do.

We should also understand with respect to credit unions and caisses populaires that when we move in this area—and although I mentioned it before I will mention it again—there are those people who feel that the movement towards broadening the powers of credit unions and caisses populaires means as of necessity that they will be omitted and that they won't be brought along in giving them the same powers and the same abilities to expand their line of financial products.

We've talked very briefly and I appreciate that the member for Scarborough Centre has indicated that he will be moving forward, at least the ministry will be moving forward, to bring in amendments to the Loan and Trust Corporations Act and to the Insurance Act that will help, for instance, the mutual insurance companies to also expand their line of products. I wish I had a time frame

for that, because as we go to committee, it would be nice to know that when people express concerns about being disadvantaged in that playing field out there, they can expect to have their concerns addressed within a very short time period indeed.

1620

I took what the member for Scarborough Centre said here today as an undertaking to us all that those pieces of legislation would be forthcoming very, very soon. I'm not talking about a matter of months or whatever. I would hope he was basically saying that those things are very close indeed; in fact, that if we could see drafts of the legislation which might be brought forward, he and the Minister of Finance would perhaps entertain the introduction of those pieces of legislation even in this sitting so we could get on with establishing that there is a real level playing field out there for all of the participants.

I have to say something else too, as I think about this piece of legislation. Generally, I think the people would say the New Democrats are not seen to be the biggest proponents of earning income from capital. You're not generally seen to be capitalists, Madam Speaker, although I don't mean to say "you" as it applies to your own financial circumstances or whatever.

In my time here, which is only 13 years, there seems to have been a series of speeches made by New Democrats in opposition which really were against anybody making money from the investment of capital. A capitalist was a bad, bad person. "Profit," for heaven's sake, is a bad word. In fact, "profit" is still a bit of a bad word these days as it applies to certain government initiatives, although I don't know what the circumstances are.

In any event, with that background and my bias established by those years of listening to New Democrats speak about capitalists and profit, I congratulate you for coming forward and recognizing that the financial services industry is an important feature of Ontario's economy, that the investment of capital is an important feature of a stable economy, that the securities industry is an important feature of our economy, that the life insurance industry is an important feature of our economy, and bringing this bill forward.

I have to say at this point that I was surprised, actually, that this bill has come to us in this form at this time. Forget about the omnibus nature of it; I just didn't expect non-capitalists, or at least people who frowned on people making money from capital investment, to be the proponents of this, and I congratulate the New Democrats for actually having the stamina to come forward and develop this legislation and move it here.

**Mr Owens:** There are more business people on this side.

**Mr Elston:** The member for Scarborough Centre just told me that there are more business people in the New Democratic Party membership than there are over here.

**Mr Owens:** Absolutely.

**Mr Elston:** He said, "Absolutely." Well, it's very surprising. We'll have to go bit by bit across the general membership and establish who is doing what. But it is, for me, a very big indication that the New Democrats are



going to have a very difficult time indeed with some of the old speeches that were made. I know the Minister of Finance, who used to talk about nationalizing all kinds of things, backed away from that. Bob Rae gave us a 60-page treatise in January 1990 which basically said: "Oh, we're not so bad. We don't want to nationalize everything." He has retreated from their traditional roots.

Perhaps this is a real sign that they have really been moved into the modern world themselves, that they now recognize that what has been a focus of economic activity in the province of Ontario is actually okay. It didn't used to be okay, when I recall listening to Floyd and Bob Rae and Michael Cassidy and all those other people as they then were in opposition, but now I think with Bill 134 we have seen the movement of the New Democratic Party to give a sense of their political party's legitimacy badge to making money from the investment of capital, in fact for making a profit from the investment of capital. I think that's a marvellous step forward.

It's also interesting to note that while they have introduced some amendments to the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act, they have spent a fair bit of time as well dealing with securities. I think what they did was try to hide the fact that they were dealing with the Securities Act. They tried to put it underground, so to speak, so that they wouldn't be seen to be doing very much with the securities industry. What they have done with the securities industry is that they have gone into promotion of the role of the self-regulating organizations.

As I recall, when I was minister and before—and I can be corrected if I'm wrong—the New Democrats were against that type of initiative. The mandating of self-regulating organizations to take over the regulatory role in the province was not on the NDP agenda. But they have come out with this legislation, and things like the Investment Dealers' Association of Canada and others are now given a Good Housekeeping badge of approval by the New Democrats. That wasn't where they always were.

I think the member for Scarborough Centre is pretty close to saying, "He's right." His head is going on a 45-degree angle. I know he's not sleeping, because his eyes are still open. His face, now getting slightly redder than it was before, perhaps displays the embarrassment of the change of heart or the recognition of the real world in a manner which confirms that they have tried to hide this new change of direction of the New Democratic Party.

It's interesting when they do this, not because they have done it, because in the circumstances in which we find ourselves now, a very tight fiscal situation—all of us recognize that—they have gone to do what they believe is practically possible. Perhaps this shows a wee bit of a pragmatic streak in a couple of the people, probably most notably in the Minister of Finance, for whom I have a very real regard. At the end of the day, while the member for Nickel Belt is seen to be the most secure in his philosophical roots, he is also seen, as the Minister of Finance, to be a person who is most practical about ensuring that there is a survival of a financial markets industry in the province. I congratulate him for that.

But one of the things that has occurred is that while they have gone forward to checkmark the self-regulating

organizations and their role in providing regulation, because the government, quite honestly, can't do it, they have not been able to give precise instructions about how the role is to be carried out or what the authorities for the role being carried out are, in fact the manner in which the self-regulating organizations are to actually do business. That is every bit as important as actually indicating that they are to do business, because the manner in which their instructions are given will determine how effectively the regulation is to be carried on. That is very important.

I raise an issue here for us all to consider, for instance, and it deals with a couple of parts of the bill. When shares are issued by Murray Elston Inc, I have to provide a public prospectus so that if you, Madam Speaker, were interested in investing in my company, you could go to the prospectus. The prospectus is supposed to say, "Elston is made up of the following assets, the following liabilities. They do this business, they do that. Here are the officers," and give you the whole story. It's a public recitation of all of the facts you need to know so that you're not deceived when you are led to put money into my organization.

It will be interesting to see what sort of prospectus is provided when the shares are issued from credit unions and caisses populaires, because it's a brand-new activity. For instance, is the issue of those stocks, the issue of those shares, governed by the Securities Act? Should there be a prospectus accompanying the public offering of those shares to the public? Who is to monitor the type of information that is made available when those shares are issued?

Perhaps the member for Scarborough Centre can tell us that all of those details have been worked out, except I haven't been informed of how those are to be worked out. It may be just that I haven't read all of my mail from the Minister of Finance or the member for Scarborough Centre. Perhaps they have told us how the public offering of shares in credit unions is to be governed, what sort of information is to be made available and where the information is to be made available and how people are to be given full public advice on the situation with each of the credit unions that chooses to offer the shares for capital.

1630

That's just one interesting example, and I'm sure that people will be able to provide me with the answers. It will be interesting to receive those answers when we get to committee, or even before, if the people are able to provide that information to me.

I think we should also be aware that while some activities that are talked about in this legislation are going on, there are other activities which are going on which actually conspire against the investment of money in small-town Ontario. I just raise as an issue what is only partially related to this, because you've opened the issue of the Securities Act, that there is a part-time dealers' provision in the Securities Act which has now been enforced by the securities commission. Somebody who offers as a part of their business the sale of GICs is now being required to pay a levy of some \$1,500 to be registered, plus I think \$250 per person for each individ-

ual who's selling, plus, plus, plus, plus, which really means to say that at the end of the day some of the people who sell GICs and other financial products in small towns are really being forced to pay huge amounts of money proportionate to the amount of money they collect for investment in small-town Ontario, or the villages of Ontario, if I can put it in those terms.

Sometimes the commissions which people earn are less than \$3,000 or \$4,000, but the cost of getting enrolled in the program could be upwards of \$2,100, \$2,200, \$2,300 as a minimum, which really tells the person that they have to get out of the business; otherwise, they'll be faced with fines because the regulation for part-time dealers becomes too costly, not because the regulation itself shows that there is a problem but because the expense of being registered or the expense of being found to be selling and not registered is so high that it basically says, "We cannot afford to do business in the small towns in the province of Ontario."

That results, by the way, in making sure that the small dealers are all eliminated and only the large survive. The banks, by the way, are not registered under part-time dealers, and it seems rather strange that as a result of that particular policy, it would seem to clash against the movement that was made on the credit unions and caisses populaires, which is to provide a broader service of financial products for credit unions to provide in small-town Ontario, while we eliminate in others the ability of part-time dealers to provide financial services in those places.

By the way, not all small communities have credit unions or caisses populaires. In the riding of Bruce, for instance, we don't have a large number of credit unions and caisses populaires, but we have generally had a series of small, part-time dealers who basically sell GICs and a few other services. But those people have been put out of business and, as a result, the movement of investment of funds has now had to be made to the banks and other large institutions, which means that perhaps the money is being taken out of the community, in direct conflict with the policy which I see being enunciated under Bill 134.

I am concerned about some of the conflicts. I'm concerned about some of the differences which are being shown by the initiatives here and by some of the initiatives which are being practically delivered under some of the existing legislation. This legislation doesn't solve all of the difficulties in small-town or rural Ontario or northern Ontario with respect to financial services. It does say that there should be a broader playing field for the credit unions and caisses populaires. It does say that for some credit unions and caisses populaires there will be watershed decisions taken about how far they choose to move in this area.

It's one which concerns me only from the standpoint of the security of individual members. That really is at the heart of the caisse populaire and credit union movement. The general welfare of the membership is what has brought them all together and it is what has to be shown in our committee time is not going to be harmed or hindered whatsoever.

I think that in some ways this legislation may provoke

the end of some of our smaller credit unions or caisses populaires. I am concerned that some people will say: "I can't compete. I have waged the struggle very hard to make sure we've got a stable organization, but the membership is too small to get into this business and I have but one option and that is to go out of business or to find an organization which will take me over."

I think that may be in the back of the minds of the OSDIC people who are concerned about financial stability, only from a different point of view. They say, not that they've waged the war, but they are sort of concerned and saying, "Oh, my gosh, this may mean that the small credit unions will be forced to do things they're not able to do, that we don't see any other option but we'll have to step in"—"we" being OSDIC—"and provide the security for the membership of those small organizations."

It would be too bad, I think, at the end of the day, if in fact this legislation forced the elimination of some of our smaller members because, in my view, they do provide a real service. In some ways what is charming about the way credit unions do business—and I don't mean charming from some sort of quaint or whatever manner of speech—but what gives them such a strong local essence is that they know their people, they count on the bond in a real way, the bond of commitment and honesty that sometimes would not be seen by a larger institution when they go about receiving an application for financing.

They know, for instance, that Joe Blow perhaps doesn't have as much security as they might otherwise require but, because I am the chairman of the credit union, or the president, or I am the manager and I have known that Joe and his family have for years worked their backsides off and have always come through with the money, I know they'll do it again, and that in real essence the bond to the credit union and the bond to the community is used as part of the security for the loan that the credit union might very well make to a person who wouldn't have enough security to get financed by another organization.

If we eliminate all of that type of activity and we force the end to that type of lending practice which gave Joe credit for his intentions, then, of course, we are eliminating part of what is very valuable about caisses populaires and credit unions. There is an intangible element in the financial services provided by credit unions and caisses populaires which is not duplicated anywhere else, and if we lose that, then I think we lose a fine asset in the province of Ontario. Perhaps that's what behind part of the concern expressed to me by some people about this legislation's intent.

I should mention I don't want to indicate that there is not a real importance in it but I would like to say that, likewise, the life insurance industry is an important aspect, an important player, in our economy and there have been for some years some efforts being taken by life agents to update their legislation. It has been going on for at least as long as when I was minister and since then, and there were some real differences of opinion between a couple of associations on how they would work out the



whole issue of sponsorship and for whom I may work. Some people want to issue products for more than one company, but generally speaking the life agent was a person who offered only one company's product.

1640

The whole issue now is obviously being resolved to the satisfaction of the life agents. They are writing to me and indicating they want to move forward with the legislation. I'm happy to say we will be moving forward with the legislation, but at the same time I would like to see them come in to our committee just to provide us with the sense of security that we need as legislators that the movement is going to be good for the people of the province of Ontario and that we can be assured that while this step is being taken, all are satisfied that the securities of the people who will buy life insurance products will be in no way influenced negatively by the movement.

Having said all the things I've said, I'm looking forward to this legislation moving fairly quickly. We have to get together with the other House leaders to see how long it will be in committee. I don't expect that to be long, but we would like to hear from the interested parties so that we can receive some assurances. We certainly want to hear from the ministry so that it can provide us with the sense of security we need to be absolutely sure we are stable and well established, on sound footing, so that we can get a good start to these new programs.

Finally, I would like to hear a definite time period from the ministry or from the minister with respect to the other areas I've enumerated that need amendments as well. I think that if we can do that between now and the next few weeks, that will be a real service to the financial services industry in Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker:** Comments or questions? The member for Scarborough Centre.

**Mr Owens:** I want to thank the member for Bruce for his comments. He's addressed a number of areas all coming back to essentially the same issue, which is the issue of investor-member protection, and I think that we share, I know that we share the same concern.

I believe it was either the member for Bruce or the member for Wilson Heights, during the auto insurance, both former ministers of Financial Institutions—we had the opportunity to have a conversation about what happens when a financial institution goes down. There was an acknowledgement of some personal pain that's associated with the failure of a financial institution.

I think what happens, particularly with credit unions in smaller communities, when a smaller credit union goes down or goes out of business, it's the neighbours who know each other. We're not talking about some kind of Re-Mor/Astra Trust companies where there's a huge number of people and they may or may not know each other. In terms of some of the communities that the member for Bruce represents, or some of the folks in my community of Scarborough Centre, because they know each other, because there is this bond of association, when there's a credit union failure it's a very personal and a very painful process for people to lose their savings

and possibly their homes as a result of a failure.

I think that in terms of this bill we will provide that protection and we will ensure that the credit unions keep their community base, and we are simply allowing the credit unions to expand their operations with that added consumer protection.

**Mr Tilson:** Just a few comments on what the member has indicated, and it's really in addition to the comments that have been made by the member for Scarborough Centre. I think that generally speaking most members of the House will be supporting this legislation, although there may be some changes that may be suggested.

One of the concerns I have was reiterated by you when you were making your comments. You commented about the issuance of stock, about someone coming along and taking over these credit unions. There's that issue, and there's the issue of the monopoly. I don't know. Hopefully, as the debate goes on or as we hear more about it, that assurance will be given by the government or there'll be something the government can refer to in which the little guy—is the little guy going to be able to handle all of this legislation? Is the little guy going to be able to survive this legislation? Life is becoming more and more complicated for the little guy. In other words, we're dealing more and more with big government, big credit union, big almost everything.

It gets back to the small communities that this member represents and that I represent, in the rural communities specifically, where there is that understanding, that personal feeling of dealing with individuals. Hopefully, that won't be lost with this legislation. That is the major reservation I have to this entire legislation, the fear of the creation of a monopoly, the fear that the little person may not have the service that was provided in the past. That is a point on which I think the member should be congratulated in his speech to this House and hopefully he will reiterate it again in his two-minute response.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you to the member for Dufferin-Peel. Any further comments or questions? The member for Bruce has two minutes to respond.

**Mr Elston:** I appreciate that there will probably be more information available to us when we get into committee and I think the answers to those questions perhaps will be forthcoming in another forum, but they are important for us to have for the public when these pieces of legislation go through. The sense of security is what the financial regulation of business is all about, and that's the nature of the questions I have.

I started to say, I think at the beginning of my remarks, that this is probably a good piece of legislation to start a new session with, or at least this new sitting with, because of the fact that generally speaking I think there is a fair bit of cooperation around this. I don't think any of our organizations are opposed. I'll await the member for Markham. He has given me some assurances earlier that he is going to support it as well, and I suspect he will.

Perhaps we can demonstrate to the public that in areas of common interest where the legislation is generally balanced and moderate, it is easy, or easier, to move

through the legislative process. That this is an example of that at the beginning of this session is probably a good way to begin it. It seems to me it will demonstrate that where there are not real differences, we're prepared to work soundly and firmly together to promote some genuinely good pieces of legislation.

At the same time, I guess we have to tell people that not all the pieces of legislation are going to be received like this one, and that's why, when somebody says, "Of course you're going to support the next couple that are going to come along and that we're going to introduce," I can't always commit to that because we haven't seen the product yet. But when the product arrives, we'll be able to deliver a verdict on those.

**Mr Owens:** Trust me.

**Mr Elston:** The member for Scarborough Centre says trust him. I'm prepared to trust myself when I see the legislation that he has prepared in those other areas.

**Mr Cousens:** As we continue this debate on Bill 134, I am pleased to participate, and as my honourable friend from Bruce has just indicated, I think there is a general consensus that the government in approaching the credit unions has done some good homework.

It's a complicated bill, and once we start touching on the financial institutions in our province, we have to make sure that everyone is protected, the consumers most of all, the investors. All the participants must understand the changes as they are going on. Not only do we have to understand the details of the bill; we also have to have a good feeling of what the regulations are going to be bringing out.

I see it as one of the important pieces of legislation we'll be dealing with. Certainly we can't be so fickle as to say everything in it is perfect. There are going to be a number of issues we want to work through and discuss further with the government, and as we do that, hopefully the government will have some good responses and also a willingness to address these concerns.

1650

When the member for Scarborough Centre completed his opening remarks, I asked him rather specifically why it was that the government hadn't dealt with the whole issue of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act. His answer wasn't acceptable at all, because he didn't indicate when this would begin.

We're dealing with a news release, and I have a copy of it. The advantage of having a great assistant is that you don't lose anything: They gather it, and when you want to bring it out, it's there ready for you.

On October 29, the Minister of Financial Institutions at that time, Brian Charlton, said, "Okay, we're going to do something about financial services." He said, "It's of vital importance to the Ontario economy," and we all agree with that.

Then he said, "It's a major employer and provides a principal source of financing for economic growth, development and renewal in the province." That to me is also an important statement. You've got the pillars of the financial institutions that can and are able to provide the investment capital for entrepreneurs and business people,

the small business person especially, to expand their business, to open up a new business. Anything we can do to try to make capital available for the reactivation of our economy is something we really must do. That was part of the intent behind this bill, and I was looking for more of that.

To the credit of the Minister of Finance, that is one thing that is going to be accomplished by this change in the legislation for the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act. It will mean that the credit unions that have large amounts of capital available will be able to invest more than just the 15% that they have until now, up to 35% or thereabouts, in entrepreneurial small business enterprise. This again is a way of touching on what is one of the urgent needs in our society, the availability of capital for small business. If anything is going to lead to jobs, it will be to have money available so that business people who want to make those jobs available can draw upon capital for whatever it is that it takes to produce those jobs.

To that extent, they have touched on it here. It's at least one of the ways in which it can be done, through the credit union system, but I am disappointed when we look for results on behalf of the government for these initiatives.

The government has done something about credit unions and caisses populaires. It has done something on the Insurance Act, and I'm supportive of the changes to the Insurance Act. It would appear that the insurance industry, and we'll touch upon this as we go through further debate of the bill, will have more of a self-policing capability. There will also be an increased educational service for those who are selling life insurance and more of a statement of whom they're brokering for. The whole insurance industry will be in a position to continue to regulate itself.

I was worried, and I think the insurance industry as well was concerned, that with banks especially and now credit unions having the ability to sell insurance services, was it going to cut into the insurance industry's ability to continue to provide its services? I want to touch on that, because to me it's one of those very important issues.

Having had excellent insurance agents wherever I've been and whomever I've dealt with, not only for my life services but also for my car, my household and my belongings, I have to say that the insurance industry is one of the most important industries in our province. We must do everything we can to keep a strong, independent insurance industry active and alive, allowing it to make a reasonable profit but allowing and encouraging it to continue to provide the services that are so essential to society. As one who has drawn upon them—you buy insurance, and you want to make sure you have it. It's terrible when you have to cash in, to use some of those services when you've had a leak in your house or whatever it is, but at least you have it there and it protects you.

On the life insurance side in particular, I think the government is showing a responsible attitude towards the insurance industry and is doing it in such a way that it's not giving away the ship, as it has been inclined to do in



so many other things this government has touched, to allow the government to take over or undermine that industry.

In fact, what is interesting about this bill is that both the credit union and *caisse populaire* and the insurance industry are saying, "We support the general intent of the bill." Whereas earlier there was some concern that the bill was going to be a problem, I'm satisfied that the discussion and dialogue between the government and industry representatives have been generally conducive to a good atmosphere of working things through.

I can't say the same, though, for what's happening with this ministry on the third issue that was addressed in this press release of October 29. The government said, "We will review and concentrate on much-needed reforms as well to the Loan and Trust Corporations Act." I have to ask specifically, and I already did ask the parliamentary assistant, when are you going to deal with the Loan and Trust Corporations Act? There are so many things that can be done to help those companies. The banks are having magnificent and wonderful changes allowing them to become far more all-encompassing financial institutions, and meanwhile trust companies are being limited on what their options are.

I can't emphasize that enough, on behalf not only of the trust companies—they're not the concern—but of the people across Ontario, where in small communities and elsewhere those trust companies have provided a long-time service to those communities. We really want to ensure that they have the opportunity to provide the services people are looking for, that we do something to eliminate the regulatory overlap and duplication that goes on between the different systems, something to achieve harmonization between the banks, the trust companies and now the credit unions. Let's not deal with them totally in isolation. Let there be some kind of effort on the part of the government that says, "We're going to deal with the important issue of the trust companies."

You've got all kinds of regulations coming on, and there's a high cost of the regulations for the trust companies. What is happening is that along the way we have seen a number of trust companies collapse over the last few years. There's an urgent need to deal with that, because indeed we have seen what happened with Seaway, Standard Trust, quite a series of them that have got into trouble.

What I would like is to see that we look at the trust companies, have a sense of what the regulations are at the different levels. Wouldn't this be an amazing thing, if the Ontario government were to say we're going to eliminate the Ontario government supervisory groups over trust companies, that as long as trust companies are compliant with the federal laws, we can eliminate the Ontario review side of it? What's that going to save? Why can't we start looking for ways that at the provincial level we try to be more compatible with the federal jurisdiction? To me, that is something we should be aiming for. As well, we should be looking for ways to see that those trust companies can offer a broader range of services.

I have every reason to believe that if we were to look at these issues, significant savings could be brought

about. Not only would the savings assist the province in its costs of running this huge, monstrous system we've got, but they would go right to the depositors, the investors and the people who have money tied up with those institutions.

One more thing on Bill 134. What a bill. It's unfortunate that the government continues to try to put everything into one little binder, although it's not so little this time. With 184 pages, you begin to say that's an awful lot of legislation. I can accept the fact that you're going to have a large bill, because what we're doing is rewriting the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act—that's really largely what's here—but then the government, in its lack of wisdom, starts putting in lots of other sections beyond that.

After the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act, then we come in with the life insurance act and its changes. How many life insurance agents do we have in Ontario? This is going to touch on every one of them. How informed are they as to the changes in this legislation? How ready are they for the changes that are being wrought upon them? I think there's an element there of educating those who are involved in the industry, and maybe their own industry has been doing a job to make sure they're aware of it, but there is also a ramping up that will go on so that those who are involved in the life insurance industry will become—well, they are professional people as it is, but they want to become better at their job and more equipped to do what's going to be required of them because of Bill 134.

1700

The third issue is the Ontario Securities Commission. We bring in a number of changes that affect the Ontario Securities Commission. So there's a third bill that is tied into this general bill. Most people will be thinking, well, it's just a credit union act. It isn't. It affects three major institutions in the province of Ontario.

While I was waiting, I had a chance—reading all the sections becomes a challenge with the time we have, but at the very back of the bill there are other sections that are amendments to other acts, and the bill touches upon 11 other acts. It's one thing to just deal with the credit union business, the life insurance and the Securities Act, but then when you start realizing that the bill, and I just want to touch on it, deals with the Cemeteries Act, and that has to do with certain credit-union-related things—I just wish somehow or other that it could be tied in to another part of the bill.

Then we have another section where the Compulsory Automobile Insurance Act is referred to. I suggest that people have a look at that because it has to do with regulations on motor vehicles requiring them to have a contract for automobile insurance. I thought that was required already, but maybe there was one section that didn't have it.

Certainly I would ask Mr Owens, the member for Scarborough Centre, to comment or to be prepared when we get to committee to discuss some of these other acts that are involved.

It also deals with the County of Oxford Act as it

relates to them with their credit unions. It deals with the District Municipality of Muskoka Act.

It deals with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. That's something I will touch on in my remarks, because one of the concerns we have had in the past is that when people ask for information through their credit unions through the freedom of information act, they are not able to get that information. If this is an approach to try to expand that availability of information, I think that would be good. I don't think it is, but I will be anxious because they have now opened this up in this bill, to make some amendments with regard to making it possible for members of credit unions and caisses populaires to obtain, through freedom of information, certain information that would be required of their boards of directors.

The other act at the back of this important piece of legislation is the Law Society Act. It's making a number of changes, again, as it applies to credit unions. I have to see why.

The Loan and Trust Corporations Act is being amended. The Power Corporation Act is being amended. The Regional Municipalities Act is being amended. The Toronto Futures Exchange Act is being amended. I have to admit that I'm going to have to have other specialists look at that in order to assist me in understanding what those changes mean. I don't expect the honourable parliamentary assistant to have those answers, but I know that it behooves ourselves to make sure we understand what that is all about.

Finally, there are changes to the Stock Exchange Act.

So at the very back of this Bill 134, there are 11 other acts mentioned in addition to the three at the very beginning. When people come along and say, "What are you doing at Queen's Park, guys and gals?" we're not just reading acts; we've got to understand what they're all about and what impact they have.

I am one who has belonged to the credit union since 1967. I've been part of the credit union movement for a long time. Since 1967, I've belonged to one credit union and have followed the success and the peaks and valleys of that credit union. I have to go on record as saying I think it's one of the best little financial institutions that you could possibly have. I personally think there is a service level that we, as members of the credit union, any credit union—I haven't seen people knock credit unions. I know there are issues in credit unions and there are many that have failed or have had trouble because they have not kept up to the regulatory standards, and the new bill will address the audit standards and other changes that are required.

But let's just talk about those credit unions that are doing such an outstanding job. Let's give them credit. Let's understand them as being what they are: very responsible, people-owned, people-operated operations that help people. Where a bank would turn them down and where other institutions didn't understand their need, a person could go into their credit union and if they're putting an addition on their home or they're buying a car or they even have repairs to their car—it doesn't really matter what it might be—they can sit down with a

financial adviser and know that their situation is going to be listened to; it's going to be understood.

The other thing that happens so often that isn't available everywhere, but I know it is in the credit union, is you'll get some advice and they'll come back and—I know some of the advice has been, "Hey, don't do that now. Let's look at your whole financial picture," the kind of thing a good financial counsellor would tell someone, but from the credit union counsellor it really has meaning because they're like ourselves and when you go to them they're in a position to say, "This is the good advice you need."

If you think I'm happy with the credit unions, I am. I've been so fortunate to have been a member of—and I'll mention the name of the credit union and then I've done my little plug for the day. It's the Honeywell credit union and I'm still a member of it. They're just fabulous people doing a wonderful job for common, everyday people. The only other thing that's really good to give them a plug is where you can have—

**Mr Sutherland:** Politicians.

**Mr Cousens:** Politicians—I think we should have our own credit union here. I'd go for it because in one way it's a disciplined way of saving when you can have it right off your salary and you can put it in and then you can have your little nest egg and then use it for Christmas or something else.

**Mr Owens:** What about solvency?

**Mr Cousens:** Oh, yes, it helps the solvency.

**Mr Sutherland:** We don't want this like the bank of Congress.

**Mr Cousens:** No, we don't want it like that. But let's just understand, people of Ontario, that credit unions have a very important place, caisses populaires as well, in our society and as part of our financial system.

I worried when I saw how some of them have been in very, very serious trouble in recent years. It's not an easy thing when you start seeing people's money getting into trouble because those very credit unions just haven't had the kind of—it's supervision as much as anything and it's an audit supervision. It's saying you can be out there doing it right. If you're going to be self-regulated, that's wonderful, but there has to be some kind of Big Brother who's watching over it to make sure that those operations are according to a financial standard that is acceptable such as our own Provincial Auditor would lay down for the province, that every organization will have its own internal auditor but there's also going to be an external audit capability.

For some credit unions it might be a little hard and a little new discipline to start accepting some of the changes, but implicit to this bill, it's saying as a government there's been discussion and debate, the credit union can continue to be strong, it has an opportunity to continue to operate but the guidelines are being tightened, they're being changed and they're generally in a position to make sure that the credit unions don't let down their investors, their shareholders, the people who are part of them.

There are going to be issues in this bill—and I really



sincerely hope that the government is open-minded to a number of the issues that are going to be raised—that keep coming up. I'm going to be very careful not to mention the name of the person or the particular credit union that has been referred to in this letter, and I'm not exactly sure that all the points are addressed by the bill nor are they solved by the bill, but may I just say that as early as early March this year I had a letter from an Ontario citizen who is outlining concerns about credit unions.

He says that there are some 230 credit unions that have had to be liquidated or amalgamated since September 1987, some of them through plant closures, and I can see how that would happen. So the credit unions are going through massive change in and of themselves. I haven't seen the total impact that has had on the unions. In fact, if anything may be going on, there may be an amalgamation of credit unions happening so you're getting bigger and bigger credit unions.

1710

The point the member for Bruce brought up, which I want to touch on, is that the very small credit unions may be the ones that have a hard time surviving with the change. I don't want to take away from the ability of the small credit union to continue to operate, or to start up, and that if there's going to be an opportunity for some group that wants to start a credit union, it is still possible for them to pool their resources and find a way of doing that.

This person who wrote this letter—I will make sure the member for Scarborough Centre gets a copy of this letter and then is in a position, privately, to comment on it, especially as to the issues—makes great complaint that the financial ministry also controls the freedom of information, “which makes it impossible for credit union members to get the facts when the ministry doesn't want to give them, allowing them to virtually be able to control through no information, misinformation, delayed information,” and it goes on.

I am concerned and would like to at least have discussed at some point that issue for members of credit unions, when they are shareholders and they are members: Is there any way for them, presently or in the bill or in the future, to have access to information that's going on within that credit union through the freedom of information? I think it's always our intent to make sure that things are open, and if there is some way in which we can address the bill to make sure that access to information is an open door—I know it is in my situation. I just want to make sure we've protected all people.

The second point in this particular letter has to do with the Ontario Share and Deposit Insurance Corp. It talks about the lack of control of that and how the superintendent investigative unit may not have the freedom to do the things it should be able to do as it pertains to the Ontario Share and Deposit Insurance Corp. I want to see that we review that to the extent that the person makes another point in this letter and says, “Local police forces are ill-equipped to handle any theft or fraud that exists in these institutions or to enforce the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act, and leaves the enforcing in the hands of

the ministry.”

I think the new audit approach that's being developed by the government in the new Bill 134 will begin to address some of these concerns and means that if a person—I'm going to be interested in having a clear answer on this question—under the new act has some concerns of any kind about the goings-on in the credit union of a financial nature as it pertains to their investments and their shares, or whatever assets that make up the credit union, through the auditor that information would at least be reviewed, investigated and there would be some satisfaction to the person who raised the question.

I'm going to leave this issue, but there are some credit unions where they have not abided by the existing regulations. When that has happened, then we've seen default and breakdown and closing down of those credit unions. The concern that this person has, and it's really the same point I was just touching on, is that it needs to be enforced in the proper manner, and to what degree are we sure the act is being enforced evenly and evenhandedly across the province.

The person goes on and talks about another point, the violation of his rights as a credit union member. He feels there are certain fraudulent acts that have taken place within an existing credit union and that he hasn't been allowed to get the information he needs.

It all ties very closely together as one series of points. If Bill 134, as an act to revise the credit union act, is going to address some of those types of concerns, then those are steps in the correct direction.

When we start looking at this bill, we understand just how big and complicated this whole system is. All you have to do is look at the table of contents to gain an understanding of all the elements that go into making a credit union. The index itself takes several pages. What you start looking at is how you establish a credit union; the objects, the powers and miscellaneous; who the memberships are; the capital structure; capital and liquidity; governing the credit union, the whole sense of how that is done; the powers they have in business; the restricted party transactions; their meetings, how they are; returns and inspections; enforcement; the credit union league, which is an important part of it; the Ontario Credit Union Deposit Insurance Corp, how that's going to work and all those; the dissolution, amalgamation and reorganization of credit unions is dealt with; the regulations of the credit unions; offences when you're in breach of some of the regulations; and miscellaneous and review. So what we're really seeing is a total rewrite of the act.

As I started looking at it, what I'd like to know is if we're really in a position—on the one hand, we want to see more money available to business to expand, to develop, to grow, and what we really also want to do is strengthen the credit union movement. I understand an estimated 1.8 million Ontario citizens, roughly 18% of the Ontario population, are members of a credit union, and what the credit unions have long argued is that provincial laws and regulations have put them at a competitive disadvantage relative to other financial institutions by limiting the range and type of products and

services they could offer. By virtue of that failure to understand it, hopefully Bill 134 will address this imbalance.

Bill 134 parallels at the provincial level federal legislation passed last June affecting the credit union centrals in Canada. These are the central banks of the credit unions. The federal law, as I understand it, was designed to put the centrals on a more equal footing with banks and help them position credit unions to compete more directly with banks. That's something I really support. Canada's well served by its banks, but boy, they sure have a monopoly on things, and then the banks are moving into so many other financial services.

Not to look at the credit unions and not to give the credit unions the opportunity to be more competitive than they have been is a mistake. So now what we're in a position of doing, since the federal government has given leadership to this, is that Ontario legislation can again follow suit and assist us in providing that extra competitive edge for this, the smallest pillar in the financial kingdom in the province of Ontario.

We see the bill that's been presented as part of a continuing effort on the part of both the provincial and the federal governments and the regulators to level the playing field in the financial services sector in response to the erosion of the traditional four-pillars system caused by the breakdown in the institutional segregation in the delivery of products and services which used to be the hallmarks of this sector in Canada.

What we're really facing up to is a changing financial system, and through the credit unions we're going to see some new opportunities for them to expand and to grow. So what we're seeing is that this new act as it affects credit unions will supplant the regulatory regime imposed on credit unions and caisses populaires by their current act, which will be repealed and replaced with a system which will allow credit unions to become more of a one-stop shopping financial service centre.

Among the major changes proposed by this bill for credit unions, what we're really seeing is new rules governing the lending practices of credit unions and caisses populaires. Current law requires that each credit union pass bylaws approved by its members and the provincial government before it can lend money, and that it can only lend money in accordance with those bylaws. In addition, the amount a credit union can lend is limited presently at only 15% of its assets, which can only be put out for commercial loans. Bill 134 proposes a general prudent standard test for lending and investment decisions and the development of a written lending policy as a requirement for a lending licence, which will define the parameters to give them the power to do it.

That makes a lot of sense. The board of directors for the credit union will be able to say: "Okay, these are the kinds of terms of reference we want. This is our own membership's money. Therefore, we want to make sure that whenever we invest that in a loan situation, we have done it according to very clearly defined terms."

1720

What will happen now—I think this is one of the

highlights of this bill and I take a certain amount of satisfaction in supporting this particular section. The indication is that the regulations to come out on lending and investment policies in terms of the capability of the unions to lend more money to other agencies for commercial lending will be as high as 35%. I wish I had the exact amount of dollars that's going to put out into the marketplace, but I would think it's probably going to be in the order of \$1.5 billion, that range of dollars, from the total reserves of credit unions. It means that some of the reserves that otherwise were locked up, untouchable, unavailable for the entrepreneur, who is starving for opportunities to make investment, can now be made available to them.

I wish the government would look to other ways of making capital available to the small business person. I realize that there are other special financial plans being set up, but the more we can make our own money work for us here in the province, the better.

Start thinking of how much money has gone from our jurisdiction south of the border and into other jurisdictions out of Canada. If we were to make changes to, for instance, the amount of money that pension funds can invest for new opportunities, for venture capital, if even up to 5% of the pension moneys could be made available for that, we would have billions of dollars made available for that, we would have billions of dollars made available to small business, or big business: Canadians lending to Canadians to help Canadians, Ontario investors putting money out to Ontario small business enterprises to help them.

**Mr Sutherland:** What about the Ontario investment fund?

**Mr Cousens:** That kind of thing, but even more so, because what we're talking about is pension funds that are separated and by virtue of the laws around them can't be used for this kind of investment into new business enterprises. That is what's holding us back as much as anything. There are a lot of things that hold us back in the province of Ontario: Bill 40, the dumb labour legislation of this province. There are many things the NDP has done that are absolutely wrong.

There is no doubt that they have created an environment that is antagonistic to business and that business has never had a tougher time just to stay alive and succeed and stay in business because of all the regulations of government. If you want to talk about a government that has done more to hurt business, there's never been anything as bad as Bob Rae's socialist crew. Since they came in with the wrecking gang to the province of Ontario on September 6, 1990, they've had a great time changing the whole environment for business in the province.

I'm starting to get mad again. I was doing well until now, but I have to say that the government really has to—I'm just getting back to it. I was doing okay until I started thinking about all—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** To the member for Markham, we're dealing with Bill 134.

**Mr Owens:** That's the problem, Don: You started thinking.



**Mr Cousens:** The member for Scarborough Centre is probably right. Once I started to think, I started to get in trouble.

But the people of the province of Ontario had better understand that there may be some things that are right in Bill 134, but the rest of what's gone on with this government since it came into operation—you start looking at the automobile insurance, where we're paying 24% more this year than last year. You start looking at what they're doing with Bill 40, and you talk to the member from Simcoe and see that some 2,000 jobs could be lost because of Bill 40. You start looking at the WCB premiums, up by 33%. You start seeing them destroying the horse racing industry with their casino gambling. You've got a business regulation fee of \$50 a year. You start seeing what they're doing with health care, day care, seniors' care. Anyway, I don't want to get off on some of the tangents where things couldn't be worse.

There isn't any doubt that under this government we have massive cleanup of things to go on once we take over and when Mike Harris becomes Premier of the province. When Mr Rae calls the election, I'm satisfied that the people of Ontario will see the Conservatives as having a very realistic alternative to offer over what the Liberals did when they were in—you guys will start agreeing now—with their 33 taxes, and your 32 taxes. We'll at least be freezing taxes.

There are enough things to be done here in the province to clean things up. Hopefully—and I want to get back to the bill, Mr Speaker—Bill 134 will have been cleaned up enough that we're not going to have to go back and reopen the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act.

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** You're talking to the future mayor of Markham. Be careful.

**Mr Cousens:** I wish the honourable member would listen and deal with Bill 134, which is the issue we're dealing with at present. You shouldn't be interrupting from someone else's seat either. There are rules in this House and you've got to learn—

**Mr Mammoliti:** I am in my seat.

**Mr Cousens:** I don't know where you sit any more; you're all over the place.

The issue we're dealing with is that if the bill is going to be correct, it's going to have to be looked at and is going to have to be dealt with. At least it may be one of those issues we can set aside and agree on after there's been a full discussion and debate so we don't have to rewrite it next year when we take over the government of Ontario.

I was dealing with the one issue in Bill 134 that has to do with availability of funds, the fact that the asset ratio for larger institutions can be as high as 35%. The fact that the government is recognizing that the caisses populaires and the credit unions are an excellent vehicle to provide investment capital for entrepreneur activity in the province of Ontario is one of those things that is a model of government.

I would like to have some comparison, and the parliamentary assistant may put this down on the list of things

when we have further debate on it. In Quebec, the caisses populaires have been a tremendous boon, and we have quite a number in Ontario. I'm anxious to know what the lending ratio is in some of the other jurisdictions by legislation and regulation. Is it as high as 35%? What's the magic in that number? The fact that it's better than 15% of the total assets of the credit unions shows that there is a capital fund we can use for investing in new business enterprises, expansion of business, new machinery, whatever. But is there a rationale why the government is saying it's going to be 35%, some 20% better than what we have now?

I'd really like to make sure there isn't any magic to the number, that there may well be—and I like the fact that each individual credit union will have the option to go back to its own shareholders and make its own regulations that would maybe limit their amount of investment in other ventures to something less than that. Again, they have that imperative from within that gives them an even tighter set of controls over what they're doing.

My own credit union lost \$70,000 in 1992, and that was a really tough year, but some credit unions lost a lot more and it's taking a while to get out of it. We have to make sure that when we're setting up the guidelines, as we are through this bill, those guidelines are realistic and workable and competitive with other provinces and jurisdictions.

Indeed, the thrust of this bill I think is extremely positive, coming from a socialist government, inasmuch as it's going to allow lenders to have more money available to them. I take that as a positive point.

But there are a number of things around it. The bottom-line question to the parliamentary assistant or to the minister is: Is there any magic to any percentage? What really are the ingredients that you look at on that? What is it that financial specialists would be saying? Would they be saying it should be higher or lower? Not being an economist, it becomes an issue that would be worthwhile assessing further.

**1730**

I'm satisfied as well that the credit unions will have a broader range of activities, as set out in section 174 of the bill. To me, this makes an awful lot of sense. It goes through them in quite some detail. The simple one that I can understand, urban transit tickets and tickets in respect to lotteries—I mean, this government's going to put lotteries anywhere it can, so you'll be able to buy your lottery tickets at the credit union, and then tickets on a non-profit, public service basis.

**Mr Owens:** Computer stores.

**Mr Cousens:** And computer stores. Well, they'll have lots of things for sale.

But the worry I have, and I have to say it only in the sense that, don't ever lose the specialty that goes on within some of these institutions. When an institution comes along and starts having too many powers, will it forget and lose sight of the primary objective of those institutions? I sincerely hope not.

Credit unions: Let's not forget they're a financial institution and that they're servicing their depositors and

their creditors, they're serving the community that they're responsible for. When you start giving them all the extra financial services that are now going to be available to them, I challenge the whole system to pause and reflect that if you're going to do something, do it well. Don't try to be all things to all people. You can't just come along and say, "Hey, I'm going to dabble in all these 10 different things."

That was one of the concerns that I had in the earlier stages of discussions about this bill, that in fact you'd see quite an expansion within the credit unions selling insurance services, and in fact what the bill has now done is say, "When prudent levels are being followed." So the bill has accepted that and is putting some guidelines around those credit unions or caisses populaires that might want to get into it.

There isn't any doubt that those services are often provided by Ontario mutual insurance associations that are next door or upstairs or nearby, so there's been an insurance link with the credit unions for generations. I just want to make sure that we don't ever take away the specialty and the value of dealing with people who truly understand their business, understand their clients, understand what it is to make investments, follow them through and do that well. That's got to be the prime focus that goes on within this. If you do that well, then the other things will flow. Then you're going to have the kind of success we all dream for them.

What we've seen here is quite an expansion of the powers that can be given out to the different credit unions to carry on business or business activity other than just purely the traditional credit union services. I don't have big problems with that. I just want to make sure we continue to remember the very purpose for which we're established.

I have the section here where we dealt with the issue on insurance services. Section 177 says, "A credit union may undertake the business of insurance or act as an agent for any person in placing insurance only to the extent permitted by the regulations." So I'm satisfied that we're not going to be taking away opportunities for other people.

I haven't seen the regulations, and I wonder if the parliamentary assistant could in fact, if there is a draft set of regulations that are being prepared—and I understand that they are being made available to the industry—I'd be very interested in having a set of those available as well. People who follow the Legislature will often forget how the system works. We come along in the Legislature, and we'll pass Bill 134. Everything passes if the government brings it up, as the member for Leeds-Grenville will know, if the government brings in a bill and it uses the majority to put the rubber stamp on it and give it first, second and third reading.

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** That's right.

**Mr Cousens:** We in opposition have a chance to comment at each of those stages, but once it passes third reading, then it goes out and is dealt with by the bureaucracy and the civil servants. At that point, and shortly after that, the regulations, which are the translation of all

the ways in which the bill is going to work, are passed by order in council. So when they're passed, who knows the impact that they're going to have upon the industry? It would be very, very helpful to us in trying to assess the far-reaching implications of this bill, if the regulations are close to being ready, if the draft is being circulated outside the Legislature to other groups, to make them available to ourselves so that we can again understand and interpret the impact that those regulations are going to have upon the industry.

That's all part and parcel of the discussion, because what happens is that the Legislature comes along, we pass this bill, and then the regulations are dealt with separately and we have no way of changing that. The legislation we deal with; the regulations are dealt with by the bureaucrats or a group of parliamentary assistants. That isn't totally satisfying, because there's so much power in the regulations.

I'm trying to think of the bill in particular—and one of my colleagues might remember the one for seniors. Was it Bill 109 or Bill 106 that was dealing with seniors, and then within the regulations the government had the right to increase the cost of care for seniors, and it resulted in something like a 30% increase to seniors. It wasn't in the bill; it was in the regulations of the bill, so it was out of our control.

If we had known—and we debated it extensively in the Legislature—how heinous, how substandard, how rotten and how horrible the regulations were going to be, we would have started raising more of a noise during the debate on the bill itself. But the regulations came out after the fact and, as a result, the seniors of the province of Ontario living in seniors homes were hit with—I think it was a 27% to 30% increase in costs for those who were paying for their own services. There was one section in there, but it was all through regulations.

I'm saying then that if the government is in a position that it has the draft regulations, make them available to us, let us understand them. We'll understand them by reading them and discussing them with our advisers, and then we'll be in a position to see that those proposed draft regulations are consistent with the intent that the government has said in all its speeches.

The problem you have is, I, in opposition, don't trust the government. It's my job in responsible opposition to look at everything the government's coming out with, and if it's positive, admit that it's positive and support it. If there is something that we can improve upon and review and test, then we have to do that as well. But our job is to be an honest opposition to do that.

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** We do that over here too.

**Mr Cousens:** You're saying no. I have to say that there are one or two things your government's done right, and I'll stand up and admit to it.

**Mr Runciman:** In three and a half years.

**Mr Cousens:** I think in three and a half years, if you do anything right, I'm willing to—the fact that you're putting in Highway 407 across northern Toronto and even the toll road, as much as I hate it, I'm willing to support it. But if you start talking about dumps and Bill 143 and



the other things that your government's been doing, I can't find too much to support. It's the regulations you've got. Bill 143 is an example where the government sets up the Interim Waste Authority and that Interim Waste Authority is decided by regulations and we never hear about it. So it's done outside of the legislation itself.

**Mr Klopp:** I think we're getting a little off the bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** To the honourable member, it's 134 and not 143 we're dealing with.

**Mr Cousens:** I have to get into Bill 143. There's such a similarity sometimes. When the government's dealing with things—

**Mr Runciman:** It's understandable.

**Mr Cousens:** It's totally understandable that I would come along and start thinking of Bill 143 when I'm dealing with Bill 134, because—

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** Only you would do that.

**Mr Cousens:** I'll tell you, I've been dealing with Bill 143, which is the whole business of dumps in and around the greater Toronto area—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Cousens:** We've been dumped on by you guys, that's what's happened, and I'm telling you that I'm going to be fighting that every chance I have. I was talking about the regulations under Bill 143 and this is—the poor people taking this in will be more suicidal now than they were when they started watching. It's just a very simple fact that has to do with the—

**Mrs Irene Mathyssen (Middlesex):** Need help on your speaking style?

**Mr Cousens:** I need all the help I can get. I know the problem we have in dealing with your guys; I'm sure you must think there are problems in dealing with people like me. You don't like to hear the truth, and that's my job, to come along and try to make honest politicians out of you people and to make sure that what you do is done correctly and well for the benefit of the province of Ontario. If I do it with a touch of humour, it's only because it's so laughable the way you've done most of the other things.

We're just fresh back and we're supposed to be all in a good spirit and a good mood—

**Mr Huget:** Who told you that?

**Mr Cousens:** I don't know. The Speaker yesterday took me aside and asked me if I'd behave myself, and I promised him that I would yesterday.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** That was then, this is now.

**Mr Cousens:** That was for yesterday. That was my commitment. This is a new day.

1740

I understand that the regulations are in draft form and that the government has them somewhere. I'd like to see the government make them available to us so that we can analyse them, assess and evaluate them to see the total impact. I'm interested in them because it would be good to allow people in trust companies and banks and other areas in financial institutions to have a look at those in

case they show some of the new and fresh intent that may be coming from the government.

One of the other things that's coming out of this bill is the investment powers, including the ability to invest in shares in community investment corporations and community loan funds for small businesses, the type provided by the earlier legislative initiative. If we're able to see credit unions invest their capital in some of the community investment activities—we've got to find ways of doing that, and I'm supportive of that intent.

One of the things the member for Bruce touched upon, and I have to give him credit for having at least one good point in his speech, has to do with the issue where the credit unions are expanding their membership base. In section 34, public sector institutions, corporations, municipalities, unincorporated businesses and partnerships may all become members of a credit unit. Under Bill 134, credit unions would be able to accept deposits from municipalities, the provincial and federal governments, crown agencies and other institutions specified in the bill.

I think there is good value in that, that that has benefits. I also want to put a proviso on that. One of the strengths of a credit union, if you take the Dutch credit union or the different unions that have credit unions—Stelco would, and the major industries—the people who are members know each other. They want to help each other.

When you start expanding the membership to go outside the existing definitions of how those groups have been formed, you are possibly eroding one of the real binding factors of the strengths of the credit unions, where those who are members have something in common, and because they've had something in common they have not wanted to be put in the position of letting down their friends, their neighbours, their co-workers, their co-inhabitants, whatever it was that brought them together within this community movement. I therefore want to make sure that we keep something of the identity of the credit unions that's in danger of being diluted by allowing an expansion to the membership of the credit union or the *caisse populaire*, by allowing people who have not got the identity of the original group that formed it.

One of the strengths, you see, is the credit union debt-to-capital ratio, especially in those that have gone defunct: People have paid back the credit union. The problem with other institutions, because they don't have that identity with the group, is that they will not have the same payback attributes. The credit union has a better ratio of collecting the money it loans out. If you no longer have the identity of the group really clear in the minds of everybody, you're going to have strangers without that kind of membership qualification and criterion who may then do something that undermines the best interests of the whole group.

I challenge both the government and the credit unions to do what they can to maintain the identity of the group in such a way that there is that continuing obligation of the membership to help each other.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Don, you are becoming boring. You need to spice it up a bit.

**Mr Cousens:** I'm being told that I'm becoming boring. Well, I'm usually boring, and I'm short of spice.

That is one issue. The next one I will go to, as I speed through, is the provision in part V of the bill to allow credit unions to raise capital by issuing non-membership shares. This is also tied in to that whole issue of the membership base that goes outside of the group you're talking about. I have some concerns about that. It's on page 30, and I was looking at that yesterday, this whole capital structure. I'll leave it this way right now: that there be further discussion about the impact this will have on investments in the credit union. I'd be very interested if the parliamentary assistant would review what's happened in other jurisdictions. He certainly has the resources, far more than we have in opposition, to see what has happened in other jurisdictions where they have expanded the membership and the capital structure into non-membership groups. I leave it at that. It sounds dry, and I'm sorry there isn't more spice.

I'm satisfied that the bill will allow credit unions to join the leagues formed by 10 or more credit unions. The vast majority of credit unions are members of leagues, and these leagues would, pursuant to another section in the bill, accept deposits and make loans and guarantee loans. The intent seems to be to provide a mechanism whereby credit unions could band together to finance larger projects. That is also in the intent of making money available where it's needed.

We could say a few more things about credit unions, but I'll leave that for the moment. There are a number of questions yet to be raised. It is a very large rewrite of existing legislation as it affects credit unions, and I'm satisfied that the general thrust the government has followed is in keeping with good dialogue with the industry and that it has addressed major concerns that have been raised. It leaves a number of questions yet to be answered and it will not be possible to deal with this in only first and second reading of the bill.

I think the way to deal with those parts of the bill is that we refer it to committee, and I would hope very much that we have public hearings so that others might be able to comment and share their views. It's so important, when you're effecting legislation that touches upon 1.8 million Ontario citizens in a very serious financial way, that we give everyone an opportunity to comment on it. If there are any insights they have that can help us refine, fine-tune or improve this legislation, it's important for us to do that.

The tougher standards for life insurance agents I think will change the way life insurance agents are regulated in Ontario. The intention here seems to be to balance the elimination of the prohibition against brokerage in life insurance of the current Insurance Act with a new regulatory scheme involving a two-tier licensing system, higher educational standards, a complaints process and a code of conduct. The insurance industry, by commenting to us that they're generally in favour of these changes, shows something that I think has been very present in the life insurance industry in particular. They have been pushing for higher standards among themselves. I know the kind of training meetings very close friends of mine

have on a regular basis. They're on top of annuities and retirement plans and benefit plans in a way that it's a specialty that is a service to our society. What we'll have here is a new system to deal with complaints that people have, and the code of conduct will have to be followed.

I'm satisfied too that the industry will be able to move towards more self-regulation. And isn't that a good thing? Doctors have that now. With self-regulation comes that responsibility to monitor themselves and make sure the standards are at the highest level: that the standard of education is high, that the review of discipline and the conduct and behaviour of its members are also at the highest level.

I think we are also seeing an improvement here where this bill will eliminate the current blanket prohibition against brokerage in life insurance in the sole occupation and full-time employment requirements. The whole blanket prohibition that you can just deal with one life insurance company will be changed. That you can be a broker for more than one is good.

We're dealing in an age where you can't just be working on one activity; you have to be capable of doing other things. Someone might be working for a transit company and selling life insurance; they might have two jobs. In our society it's unfortunate that we're at that point where people are having to carry two, three and four jobs in order to make ends meet and keep it going. Certainly, the insurance industry understands the short-falls in not being able to sell at certain times. You've got to have some stability in your income.

1750

I'm satisfied that is in the right direction. I'm satisfied as well that there's a new two-tier licensing and examination process for life insurance agents. It'll create a more stringent test to qualify for a level one licence and then it throws in an experience factor for the level two licence. That is also good.

I'm satisfied as well that there's good protection for the consumer coming up. I hope that when we are discussing this bill further, we'll see that it satisfies the needs of all the consumer protection we should have. Agents now don't have to carry this kind of insurance. Agents will be forced to carry errors and omissions insurance. First of all, they'll have to have insurance so that if they make a mistake in dealing with someone, there'll be an insurance policy that protects them. If you buy a piece of property, your real estate agent also has insurance. The same kind of insurance will now apply to life insurance agents and I think that makes good sense. They'll also be required to disclose their company affiliations, and that too should be right out in the open.

The Ontario Securities Commission changes in the act make sense to me. It gives the Ontario Securities Commission the opportunity to investigate and sanction breaches in the Securities Act and it allows it to levy the penalty according to the misdemeanour that was created by whoever was involved. It strengthens their powers, and it softens their powers in certain areas so that they don't have to necessarily use the big club all the time. They're then in a position that they can sit down, collect evidence, have a hearing and develop remedies and



adjudications more in keeping with the situation they're dealing with. So what we are dealing with are these two sections there that are important.

I am concerned with one area that will be coming up in the public hearings. We end up hearing from the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association. Is this not the opportunity to build within the legislation some form of addressing the concerns they have? Again, I pose it as a question.

I hope that by our party supporting the fact that this legislation, Bill 134, would go out for public hearings—those public hearings don't have to take a long time, by the way. I'm not indicating that there should be extended, protracted public hearings at all. If this bill is dealt with within the next two weeks in the Legislature, it could be referred to the finance committee. We could be in public hearings on this certainly by the middle or end of April and we could be back in the House by May 1 with some findings on it. I don't think there is any intention here of stalling or keeping this off the books or from being acted upon by the government.

There are two issues that recently were raised by the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association, and two resolutions were unanimously supported by its membership way back on November 8 of last year. What they asked for was the possibility of establishing a loan corporation to be owned by farm mutuals so that additional financial services products could be offered to the policyholders of farm mutuals. All they're asking is, are there other financial services such as some of the things that are presently available through the credit unions that could also be made available to the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association?

I'm not sure of the validity of this. I know it's a concern that's being raised by very legitimate organizations. I'm putting it on the table so the ministry can understand that issue better, look into it and maybe establish more dialogue with them. If it can't be done through this Bill 134, maybe there are other ways in which we could begin to address methods by which the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association can provide other financial services to its membership, because the membership in Ontario mutual insurances is in many respects similar to credit unions. Though I'm not a member of them, and so I don't have the same intimate knowledge that I have through the credit union movement, it's an issue that I at least want to table and allow to receive some consideration.

Another issue raised as well by the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association was for farm mutuals to either enter into a networking arrangement with a life insurance company to provide customized life products to their policyholders or to establish a life insurance subsidiary to be owned by the farm mutuals. Inasmuch as this Bill 134 has opened up the life insurance issue in a number of significant ways, is this the time to raise this whole issue on the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association?

By virtue of the fact that we're dealing with such important bills that affect so many people, I think one of the issues—we were caucusing this this morning in our own caucus, the Conservative caucus. The honourable

member for SDG & East Grenville, Mr Noble Villeneuve, was raising this as an issue that he wanted to make sure was addressed. People had raised it with him. In fact, as I look up, the Acting Speaker is now Mr Villeneuve, who was raising this subject with me. On his behalf, I have been very careful to present this issue. The agricultural community has a genuine concern and love for their mutuals, and if there's any way in which their concerns could be considered by the government during the process of considering Bill 134, then it would satisfy those concerns.

I table that. I wish I knew more about how it would work, but I'm satisfied that if the government can carry on in a spirit of give and take, we can at least take another four to eight weeks to work out some of these details and make sure that everybody goes away with a sense of satisfaction in it.

There are many more things to comment on in the bill. It's probably an appropriate time to pause and allow other members, if they want, to react or respond in any way on my comments, and as the debate continues, others will be able to raise their own points of view. I appreciate the attention that's been given to the bill and I apologize if I started comparing it to Bill 143, though it's Bill 134. I have such horrible memories of Bill 143 that my memories of Bill 134 don't even compare with those agonizing moments.

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I'd like to congratulate the member for Markham for a very thorough analysis of Bill 134, and 143, I suppose, at the same time.

The member has an excellent insight into financial matters and several of his comments touched a chord with me, because during my municipal career I was associated with a credit union in East York. The member for Markham has expressed concern with regard to small credit unions, and the East York credit union would fit the bill.

Certainly, there's an example of a credit union that is very close to its constituency, its constituency being the employees of the borough of East York. There is a credit union that involves the employees, the people who work in East York. They volunteer for the executive committee. They make the decisions. They're involved in the whole process in terms of people making contributions to the credit union, in terms of how the money is loaned out. There's a total involvement, and it's an excellent organization.

The member has expressed concern for the smaller credit unions: Will they be able to survive? Are we looking at a future where we're looking at the survival of larger credit unions but where the smaller credit unions, perhaps unintentionally but perhaps partly as a result of this bill—there are many excellent aspects of this bill, and the member for Markham has put them forward. But for example, in the bill the reserves will have to be at a higher rate. This may impact on the smaller credit unions. The capital can be raised from non-members. Again, this may have an impact on the smaller credit unions. So I thank the member for Markham for raising many of these points and putting them forward to us here today.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions or comments? The parliamentary assistant and member for Scarborough Centre.

**Mr Owens:** Mr Cousens raises a number of interesting issues, and some very unique issues that may not have been related to Bill 134 before, but are still unique anyway.

In terms of some of the questions Mr Cousens raised, on the issue with respect to the loan and trust amendments that were announced in the press release, there was never an intention that loan and trust legislation would precede the credit union act. It was always understood that the credit union act would go first and that the loan and trust act would follow second. So in terms of where we are at on that, we are still working with the industry and certainly hope that at some point in the future we will resolve some of the issues that are still outstanding.

In terms of the lending limits under the old legislation, as the member is aware, the percentage was 15% for commercial loans. Under our bill, up to 35% is being proposed for commercial lending in regulation. However, in terms of the kinds of consultation that are going on, there isn't an amount yet set and we will continue to work with the credit union movement to ensure that there

is an appropriate figure with, again, appropriate safeguards put into place.

The issue with respect to keeping credit unions local and keeping them community-based: I think today we have the pleasure of having Mr Jonathan Guss with us and I can tell you that he has worked hard for this.

**The Acting Speaker:** Are there further comments? If not, the honourable member for Markham.

**Mr Cousens:** First of all, I thank the honourable member for Don Mills. I don't think there's any way we can underestimate the importance of the small credit unions, and anything we can do to make sure they thrive and continue to survive through the changes that are going on and be strong is important.

I thank the honourable parliamentary assistant. I look forward to further discussions on the bill. I think there are a number of things that will come out of the discussion and I appreciate the good intent that he's shown this afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker:** It now being past 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until Wednesday, March 23, at 1:30 of the clock.

The House adjourned at 1803.

## ERRATA

| No. | Page | Column | Line | Should read:   |
|-----|------|--------|------|--|
| 38B | 1974 | 2      | 24   | who had expressed some considerable concern about how        |
|     |      |        | 25   | their pension funds might be used. They were happy           |
| 62  | 3176 | 2      | 1    | When you get right down to it, it's not necessarily          |
|     | 3177 | 2      | 34   | First of all, I'm sure everyone has heard of Margarita       |
|     |      |        | 35   | Howe from Niagara-on-the-Lake and what she's been            |
| 63  | 3212 | 2      | 31   | to have this great local control and you had to disassociate |
|     |      |        | 32   | yourself from the American union.                            |
|     | 3213 | 1      | 49   | Here we are, a construction industry with the highest        |









# CONTENTS

Tuesday 22 March 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Landfill</b>                            |      |
| Mr Sorbara                                 | 5073 |
| <b>Rural economic development</b>          |      |
| Mr Jordan                                  | 5073 |
| <b>Transit services</b>                    |      |
| Mr O'Connor                                | 5073 |
| <b>Highway safety</b>                      |      |
| Mr Crozier                                 | 5073 |
| <b>Hospital beds</b>                       |      |
| Mr Jim Wilson                              | 5074 |
| <b>Landfill</b>                            |      |
| Mr Hansen                                  | 5074 |
| <b>Native health services</b>              |      |
| Mr Miclash                                 | 5074 |
| <b>Loring deer yard</b>                    |      |
| Mr Eves                                    | 5075 |
| <b>Peterborough Green-up</b>               |      |
| Ms Carter                                  | 5075 |
| <b>ORAL QUESTIONS</b>                      |      |
| <b>Employment equity</b>                   |      |
| Mrs McLeod                                 | 5075 |
| Mr Cooke                                   | 5075 |
| <b>Family farms</b>                        |      |
| Mrs McLeod                                 | 5076 |
| Mr Mackenzie                               | 5077 |
| <b>Student suspension</b>                  |      |
| Mr Harris                                  | 5077 |
| Mr Cooke                                   | 5077 |
| <b>Mandatory retirement</b>                |      |
| Mr Harris                                  | 5079 |
| Mr Laughren                                | 5079 |
| <b>Ministry of Transportation spending</b> |      |
| Mr Mahoney                                 | 5080 |
| Mr Pouliot                                 | 5080 |
| <b>Public transportation</b>               |      |
| Mr David Johnson                           | 5080 |
| Ms Lankin                                  | 5081 |
| <b>Conservation authorities</b>            |      |
| Mr Duignan                                 | 5081 |
| Mr Hampton                                 | 5081 |
| <b>Tuition fees</b>                        |      |
| Mr McGuinty                                | 5082 |
| Mr Cooke                                   | 5082 |
| <b>Role of minister</b>                    |      |
| Mr Villeneuve                              | 5082 |
| Mr Buchanan                                | 5082 |
| <b>De La Salle College</b>                 |      |
| Mr Rizzo                                   | 5083 |
| Mr Cooke                                   | 5083 |
| <b>Job creation</b>                        |      |
| Mr O'Neil                                  | 5084 |
| Ms Lankin                                  | 5084 |

## MOTIONS

|                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| <b>Committee substitutions</b> |      |
| Mr Charlton                    | 5084 |
| Agreed to                      | 5085 |

## PETITIONS

|                               |      |
|-------------------------------|------|
| <b>Pay equity</b>             |      |
| Mr Sorbara                    | 5085 |
| Mr O'Connor                   | 5085 |
| Mr Cousens                    | 5086 |
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>     |      |
| Mr Arnott                     | 5085 |
| Mr O'Neil                     | 5086 |
| Mr Cooper                     | 5086 |
| Mr Crozier                    | 5087 |
| Mr Turnbull                   | 5087 |
| <b>Haemodialysis</b>          |      |
| Mr Jim Wilson                 | 5086 |
| <b>Gun control</b>            |      |
| Mr Miclash                    | 5086 |
| <b>Animals for research</b>   |      |
| Mr Abel                       | 5087 |
| <b>Education financing</b>    |      |
| Mr Mammoliti                  | 5087 |
| <b>Land-lease communities</b> |      |
| Mrs Fawcett                   | 5087 |
| <b>Landfill</b>               |      |
| Mr Tilson                     | 5087 |

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Standing committee on government agencies, Mrs Marland</b> |      |
| Mrs Marland   | 5088 |
| Deemed adopted  | 5088 |

## FIRST READINGS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Town of Bothwell Act, 1994, Bill Pr89, Mr Hope</b>  |      |
| Mr Hope  | 5088 |
| Agreed to  | 5088 |
| <b>Township of Huron and Village of Ripley Act, 1994, Bill Pr78, Mr Elston</b>   |      |
| Mr Elston  | 5088 |
| Agreed to  | 5088 |
| <b>Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 142, Mr Jim Wilson</b>   |      |
| Mr Jim Wilson  | 5088 |
| Agreed to  | 5088 |
| <b>Capitol Theatre and Arts Centre (Windsor) Act, 1994, Bill Pr71, Mr Dadamo</b>   |      |
| Mr Dadamo  | 5088 |
| Agreed to  | 5088 |
| <b>Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and French-language School Boards Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 143, Mr Philip</b> |      |
| Mr Philip  | 5088 |
| Agreed to  | 5089 |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>City of Hamilton Act, 1994, Bill Pr24, Mr Abel</b>        |      |
| Mr Abel  | 5089 |
| Agreed to  | 5089 |
| <b>City of Kingston Act, 1994, Bill Pr91, Mr Gary Wilson</b> |      |
| Mr Gary Wilson   | 5089 |
| Agreed to  | 5089 |

## SECOND READINGS

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Financial Services Statute Law Reform Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 134, Mr Laughren</b> |                  |
| Mr Owens  | 5089, 5111       |
| Mr Elston   | 5091, 5092, 5100 |
| Mr Cousens  | 5092, 5101, 5111 |
| Mr Sutherland   | 5095             |
| Mr Tilson   | 5100             |
| Mr David Johnson  | 5105             |
| Deemed adjourned  | 5111             |

## OTHER BUSINESS

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| <b>Visitor</b> |      |
| Mr Eves        | 5075 |
| <b>Apology</b> |      |
| Mr Owens       | 5084 |
| <b>Errata</b>  | 5111 |

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 22 mars 1994

### PREMIÈRE LECTURE

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant la Loi sur les relations de travail, projet de loi 142, M. Jim Wilson</b>   |      |
| Adoptée  | 5088 |
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant des lois concernant la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et les conseils scolaires de langue française, projet de loi 143, M. Philip</b> |      |
| Adoptée  | 5088 |

### DEUXIÈME LECTURE

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Loi de 1993 portant réforme de diverses lois relatives aux services financiers, projet de loi 134, M. Laughren</b> |      |
| Débat ajourné   | 5111 |

CA20N  
X1  
-023

Gouvernement  
Publication



No. 101

N° 101

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 23 March 1994

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mercredi 23 mars 1994

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



*50th anniversary*

**1944 – 1994**

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 23 March 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 23 mars 1994

The House met at 1334.

Prayers.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### SEMAINE DE LA FRANCOPHONIE

**M. Bernard Grandmaitre (Ottawa-Est) :** Partout dans le monde cette semaine, on célèbre l'appartenance à cette grande famille qu'est la francophonie. À Hearst, à Port-au-Prince, à Bruxelles, à Port Louis on fête, mais aussi on s'interroge sur ce que deviendra cette langue dont nous sommes tous si fiers dans notre petit coin de la planète.

J'aimerais souhaiter à tous les francophones, d'où qu'ils soient, une bonne et productive Semaine de la francophonie. Je m'en voudrais de ne pas avoir une pensée tout à fait spéciale pour nos frères et soeurs qui font partie des minorités francophones canadiennes. Je voudrais leur dire qu'il y a des raisons d'avoir de l'espoir. Je souhaite aussi qu'ils auront, au cours de la semaine, l'occasion de réfléchir sur la façon dont chacun d'entre nous peut contribuer au mieux-être de nos collectivités respectives.

Je souhaite aussi une bonne Semaine de la francophonie au ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones. Comme vous le savez probablement, beaucoup de Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes pensent que leur communauté connaît à l'heure actuelle des reculs inacceptables. J'espère que cette semaine sera pour le Ministre une occasion privilégiée de réfléchir à propos de toutes les choses urgentes qui doivent être faites en Ontario français, de se lever debout bien droit et de défendre les intérêts de ceux qu'il doit représenter.

### DAFFODIL FESTIVAL

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I would like to take this opportunity to make members of this Legislature and residents of Ontario aware of the Daffodil Festival that begins today and runs through to Saturday. April is cancer month in Ontario, and the Daffodil Festival is a precursor to this important time of the year when cancer societies band together to make Ontarians aware of the importance of fighting this deadly disease.

This week, provincial cancer societies are selling daffodils in an effort to raise money to stem the tide of cancer that grows annually in Canada. The numbers reflect this growth. More than one in three Canadians will develop some form of cancer during their lifetime. This probability has increased from one in four since 1977. As well, an estimated 121,300 cases of cancer and 61,000 deaths from cancer will occur in Canada in 1994.

But there is hope. The daffodil embodies precisely that, a sense of hope and a renewal of life. Last year more than 6.2 million daffodils were sold and millions of dollars were raised in an effort to find a cure and to

develop new treatments to battle cancer. There is hope, because the people of Ontario have given generously in the past, and an army of volunteers will knock on virtually every door in the province during the month of April asking for the public's help in this fight against this deadly disease.

I urge all members of this assembly and citizens from all across Ontario to join the crusade against cancer and to purchase daffodils this week from their local cancer society.

### JOBS ONTARIO

**Mrs Irene Mathyssen (Middlesex):** In the time since we recessed, I've had the good fortune to attend two Jobs Ontario graduations in the London-Middlesex area. I would like to thank the Jobs Ontario brokers, trainers, employers and students for making the program so successful.

I've had much positive feedback from Middlesex employers and graduates regarding the benefits that both business and trainees have derived from Jobs Ontario.

In Middlesex, more than 1,000 people have moved from unemployment insurance and social assistance rolls to long-term employment. Province-wide, the number of jobs created is almost 40,000. That's a success story.

I also think we should congratulate the trainees who had the courage to go back to the classroom to upgrade their skills. Some of those from Middlesex are: Simone de Schiffert, Carrie de Smit, Karen Haggis, Linda Jones, Doris Jordan, Linda Josh, Susan Kemp, Mary-Anne Lopes, Linda Moss, Debbie Pierce and Bev Wilcox.

I think the graduates say it best. Valedictorian Bev Wilcox told her class and proud family members, friends and instructors: "I would sincerely like to thank Jobs Ontario for providing us with this opportunity to return to school, and to be able to learn the appropriate skills which will allow us to re-enter the workforce. We have discovered areas of talent that we never realized, and we have proven to ourselves that we have the ability of setting goals and reaching them. New doors have been opened, and we truly do appreciate that and everyone for all that's been done for us."

Jobs Ontario graduates have given us much and we thank them.

### NEW LISKEARD COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming):** I stand in my place today to ask the government to delay by at least six months the disposition of the assets of the New Liskeard College of Agricultural Technology.

Since April 23 of last year, when the government brought that fatal blow to that college and closed it, the community has gathered around to try to pick up the



pieces, and presently there is a proposal being put forward by Northern College and our federal MP with regard to opening this school up in another guise; that is, we're looking at the federal government, and it has agreed to put some money towards a feasibility study to redirect some of the foreign aid money this country spends in other countries to bring students over to that New Liskeard campus site to train them here in this country.

I think it's an idea that deserves attention. Unfortunately, the government is moving with, I believe, undue haste in trying to sell these assets. I'd ask the government if it would delay that by six months to give the community in Timiskaming the opportunity to see if this proposal can be brought to fruition.

I'd also ask the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs that the resource material in the resource centre be frozen there in northern Ontario, so to speak, and be left in New Liskeard and at the college; that all that documentation and the studies and the resource material on northern agriculture remain in northern Ontario, remain at that site so that Northern College, if this deal is successful, can use that to carry on northern agriculture in another forum in the Timiskaming district. I would ask this government to slow this down so that we in the north can look at this proposal and see what we can make of it.

1340

#### FOOD BANKS

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** One of the NDP's first election promises in 1990 was to eliminate food banks in Ontario. While food banks help the needy, they fail to provide a sense of personal economic independence and fulfilment in actively earning one's daily food. This is why those most involved with food banks are also most vocal in calling on government to help end the need for them.

The NDP could have done much more in the intervening years to realize this noble goal. In this assembly, however, PC leader Mike Harris has been the sole voice in promoting school breakfast programs for children in need, and I acknowledge his leadership and support in developing four such programs in my riding.

As the chairman of Burlington Food Share, and on behalf of our food bank coalition, including the Salvation Army Family Services, St Vincent de Paul, Burlington East Emergency Food Bank and Partnership West Family Services, I wish to announce our annual Easter food drive that will continue until April 2 and will help replenish our severely strained food supplies.

Tonight at 5:30 I will host the official start of our food drive at a lasagna dinner and family night at St Mary's Ukrainian Catholic hall. In this annual event, which is cosponsored by myself and the Burlington South Provincial Progressive Conservative Riding Association, adults are asked to bring a non-perishable food donation while children are free to enjoy pizza, ice cream and a visit from the Easter bunny. Easter is a time to celebrate the renewal of life. At Easter, may we all make an effort to renew our compassion for those in our community who

experience true need, through no fault of their own. I can think of no better way than this to spread the message of a truly happy Easter.

#### PRINCE EDWARD REGION CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

**Mr Paul R. Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings):** Today I would like to talk about the Prince Edward Region Conservation Authority. PERCA, as it is known locally, is doing some very important work in maintaining the natural environment in Prince Edward county. They are doing this through such programs as Clean Up Rural Beaches, or CURB, which contribute in a large way to cleaner waterways, and through the Trash Bash, a day organized to clean up county roads, which will be held this May.

I would also like to say that PERCA is about to hold its seventh annual dinner this coming Saturday, in cooperation with the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters and the local dinner committee, and that this event has been a very successful fund-raiser for the conservation authority in past years.

Dini Petty, the television talk show host, will be the master of ceremonies, and wildlife artist Mia Lane of Adolphustown will be the featured artist. Many items, such as paintings, carvings and other works of art donated by the community, will be auctioned to raise funds. This is the kind of event that unites our communities and makes them better places to live.

I hope we will all recognize the kind of work done by our conservation authorities and the contribution they make to our respective communities. I'd also like to make a special mention of the staff and board members of PERCA who work so hard to make events like this happen so our conservation authority can go on doing the important work it is doing.

#### QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I've got a proposal to speed up question period for you, Mr Speaker. It's clear that the Premier, on virtually every question now, is going to blame the federal government. I think we can speed up question period by letting the Premier adopt what I call the RAE answer approach. RAE stands for rapid automatic excuse. We can speed things up around here by simply allowing him to say, "The answer to the question is"—and then I've given four typical RAE, rapid automatic excuse, answers.

Number 1—and he'd just have to say, "This is a number 1,"—is, "If it's a problem, it must be the fault of the federal government."

Number 2: "The Ontario taxpayers can't afford this. We'll simply get the federal taxpayers"—as if they're someone different—"to pay for it."

Number 3: "I'm not sure I know what you're talking about, but it must be the fault of the federal government."

Number 4: "I know the federal government has absolutely nothing to do with this, but if they did, I know it would be their fault."

I think we can save a lot of time. I will hand these out to the members, and yes, to the Premier. You'll just be able to say, "It's number 4." Number 4 is, "I know the

federal government has nothing to do with it, but if they did, it would certainly be their fault."

Mr Speaker, I think it will be helpful to you, because yesterday I noticed how slowly we got the questions in. I will send a page to report this to you immediately.

#### EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** My community is outraged by the comments made by Jim Turk, the vice-chair of the Ontario Council of Regents, about the need to have designated group members on the boards of Ontario's community colleges who don't think like white men.

Furthermore, I disagree with the attempt by the minister to centralize control of community colleges at the expense of local autonomy.

The representatives of Conestoga College have indicated to me that they are deeply concerned that four of their appointments were rejected in favour of your political appointee and that five others were only granted one-year extensions, giving rise to concerns that they too will be replaced by your political appointees.

While I acknowledge the assurances given by you yesterday that Mr Turk's words do not reflect government policy, I am concerned that given this government's record on employment equity and the extremely biased nature of the Lewis report, there are indeed legitimate grounds for concern and that at the end of the day we will have a policy similar to the one advocated by Mr Turk. This is totally unacceptable.

I urge the minister to ensure that his new appointments policy for college boards continues to reflect an emphasis on experience, expertise and community representation rather than Toronto politically dictated representation, since this will only result in power blocs with special interests at heart rather than the best interests of the community and the college.

#### MARY WESTLEY

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** Today, I'd like to talk about a dear friend of mine, a special person, Mary Westley, who was one of my constituency assistants.

Mary was a very giving person. She cared about people. When Mary discovered people who needed support or encouragement, she did something about it. When Mary faced challenges in her own life, she found ways to help others who were facing the same challenges.

On January 25, Mary died after a long battle with cancer.

Mary knew first hand the challenges of raising a child in a single-parent home. She carried this over into her work with the Big Brothers of Guelph. She handled recruitment, publicity and special events, including their major fund-raising event, Bowl for Millions. She also served as a board member for Big Brothers for many years.

Mary knew it wasn't easy for many parents to afford sports equipment and fees, so she helped found the Kids Can Play Association of Guelph. This organization makes sure that no child is denied sports, arts and cultural programs due to financial reasons. It is making a differ-

ence for many families in Guelph. Mary thought governments should make research and treatment for breast cancer a priority, so she helped found the Breast Cancer Support Group of Guelph to give support to women and to lobby government.

Friends of Mary Westley and the Kids Can Play Association are remembering Mary's contribution to the community by organizing a fund-raising dance to be held in her memory on May 7 at the John McCrae Legion in Guelph.

Mary started working for me shortly after my election. She helped many, many people in my riding with different problems. She organized a local injured workers' advisory group.

Mary loved her job. When I visited her shortly before her death, she talked about how she missed her work.

I will miss Mary's physical presence, but she will always be with me, for she touched my life, as she touched so many others.

1350

#### STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

##### TRANSFER PAYMENTS

**Hon Floyd Laughtren (Minister of Finance):** I rise today to inform the House of the decisions this government has made on transfers to municipalities, schools, hospitals, colleges, universities, and on social assistance and post-secondary education.

Over the past several weeks, my cabinet colleagues and I have considered our fiscal options. In January, we were looking at the need to make some tough decisions because of a shortfall of about \$1.6 billion in our revenues for next year.

Our situation has been made even more difficult by two recent decisions of the federal government. They cut tobacco taxes, forcing Ontario to reduce its own tax on tobacco products, and in its budget the federal government enshrined unfairness to Ontario by extending the previous government's cap on its social assistance funding to Ontario.

The tobacco tax decision alone will cost Ontario half a billion dollars, pushing our revenue shortfall to about \$2.1 billion.

The tobacco tax blow came on top of the lingering effect of a recession that took jobs away and a recovery that has been slow to return them. We all understand that there are unique spending pressures in such an economic cycle, and we are still grappling with these.

We could have slashed transfers unthinkingly, cut into programs mercilessly and turned our backs on the most vulnerable people in our society. We could have copied the federal government in Ottawa and downloaded our fiscal problems on to our transfer partners. We could have let thousands of public sector jobs disappear. We could have ignored the sick who need treatment, the children who need schooling and the people who need a helping hand through tough times.

We refused to take that route. I am pleased to tell the House today that we are keeping the funding commit-



ments we made to our transfer partners last year.

We acknowledge that our partners in Ontario's public sector are already working to make their services more affordable and to sustain those savings over the longer term through ongoing restructuring measures. These long-term savings flow directly from the expenditure control plan and the social contract.

We have achieved what we set out to achieve in last year's budget. With the help of 900,000 public sector workers and the contribution of Ontario taxpayers, we are preserving jobs and public services throughout this province.

At the same time we intend, in our upcoming budget, to keep the deficit on a downward track, albeit at a slower pace than we would like. Because taxpayers have already done their part, we will not raise taxes in this budget.

We have gone through the spending plans of every ministry on a line-by-line basis. We have identified, and will continue to identify, program savings that will help us meet our goal while preserving jobs and services.

We are freezing social assistance rates at their current level for the upcoming year and implementing a number of changes to the social assistance program to reduce costs.

We have also had to make tough decisions about our plans to overhaul the entire social assistance system. We cannot afford to go it alone, and the federal government does not share our priorities. Unless Ottawa steps in, we will be forced to shelve the Ontario child income program, first outlined in the white paper on social assistance reform last July. However, we have not compromised our determination to help social assistance recipients enter the workforce.

The Minister of Education and Training will also outline changes to some elements of post-secondary education as part of today's announcements.

Our measures are aimed at controlling our deficit. But we have never lost sight of our goal: to spend wisely in order to create jobs and preserve services. Other jurisdictions may make cuts across the board without careful thought about the implications, but that goes right against our idea of good fiscal management, which must also be humane management.

The need to continue our commonsense approach is one of the messages I heard in our pre-budget consultations with people across this province. In crafting our 1994 budget, we will continue to use the same common sense in managing our priorities and controlling our spending.

We have the evidence that our approach is working. The lines are all moving in the right direction: The deficit is coming down and job creation is increasing. Private sector indicators, like higher housing starts and a lower bankruptcy rate, show that the benefits are being felt throughout the entire economy. My announcement today builds on our success.

#### TUITION FEES

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** Our colleges and universities have a vital

role to play in the economic renewal of the province. Their importance is recognized in the Finance minister's decision to maintain the level of transfer payments to the post-secondary sector as previously announced. This will allow our colleges and universities to continue their restructuring efforts and adapt to the changing economy.

Post-secondary education is well subsidized by the taxpayers. Some 75% of the revenues received by colleges and universities come from the provincial government.

In addition to the transfer payments to our post-secondary institutions, tuition fees play an important role in the ability of this province to maintain high-quality post-secondary education. I have discussed tuition fees with college and university students, faculty and administrators. We have emphasized that our objective is to maintain a fair and workable balance between the revenues needed for our post-secondary institutions and the affordability of this education to students.

I understand why students are concerned about tuition increases. The cost of post-secondary education can be difficult to manage in times of economic strain. But even in these difficult economic times, we know that graduates of colleges and universities are more likely to have jobs and earn higher incomes than people who do not have post-secondary degrees or diplomas.

The contribution of tuition fees to the post-secondary sector will ensure that students get excellent value for their post-secondary investment and a lifetime of dividends from their college or university education. This is one of the reasons we must maximize access to colleges and universities. More opportunities and spaces are needed in all of our colleges and universities.

That is why I am announcing an increase in tuition levels. The increase is aimed at assisting colleges and universities to make additional spaces available and at protecting the quality of post-secondary education. I expect that our colleges and universities will follow through on their commitment to use the tuition revenues to increase enrolment.

Let me be specific. In the 1994-95 school year, tuition fees for undergraduate arts and science students will increase by \$202, to \$2,228. The following year, tuition fees for these university students will increase by \$223, to \$2,451. The standard tuition fee for college students will increase by \$92, to \$1,008, in the 1994-95 academic year, and the next year, the standard tuition fee will increase by \$101, to \$1,109. At these levels, Ontario students will continue to have tuition fees that are among the lowest in Canada.

I would like to point out that because of the social contract, this tuition increase will go directly into programs and not into salaries.

I want to emphasize that the colleges and universities must change the way that they do work. They must continue to restructure and find more—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. Stop the clock, please.

The opposition will have an opportunity, under the

rules, for a reply. I ask the members of the House to allow the minister an opportunity to complete his statement, and then there will be an opportunity for replies from the opposition.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** Maybe I should go back to the paragraph that emphasizes that even with these tuition increases, our tuitions will be among the lowest in all of Canada.

I want to emphasize that colleges and universities must change the way they do work. They must continue to restructure and find more efficient ways to operate. All of those affected, especially students, should be involved in this process.

1400

The Ontario student assistance program will cover these tuition increases for low-income students, and at the same time the loan forgiveness level will be increased from \$5,570 to \$6,000. We have called on the federal government to work with the provinces to develop a system whereby graduates pay back student loans based on their income once they're in the workforce.

Finally, I am announcing that the government will be freezing compulsory ancillary fees charged to students by colleges and universities. Ancillary fees are charged by colleges and universities in addition to tuition fees and can include charges for instructional materials kept by students, student activity fees and athletic fees. We have decided not to allow increases in ancillary fees until an agreement is achieved, developed by each institution with its students.

Over the next few weeks, officials in the ministry will be consulting with organizations from the post-secondary sector about implementing this new policy on ancillary fees.

#### TRANSFER PAYMENTS

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** I want first to respond to the statement made by the Minister of Finance. Here we are at the end of March and we're facing another end-of-March budget crisis on the part of this government. Here we have, after a whole series of rumours, of building up concern, a government that comes to the Legislature today and actually, I think, is expecting to have people congratulate it for saying, "We are now managing things so well that they're not going to be nearly as bad as we made you think they were going to be."

I for one am not prepared to congratulate the government on this because I believe this is political gamesmanship and not financial management.

I am pleased there will be no further offloading of this government's financial problems on to the colleges and universities and hospitals and municipalities and school boards of this province. This does come as a relief, since it comes from a government that has given as its first response to its budget problems every other year the cuts to all of the transfer partners. In fact, sometimes it's been twice a year that they've reached out to make cuts to the transfer partners.

I notice that once again they blame the federal government for the problems they are still facing. I categorically

reject any indication from this government that after three and a half years of financial mismanagement it can blame its budget problems on a government that has been in office for five months.

I make it absolutely clear that as this Treasurer, as this Finance minister, struggles to deal with his budget shortfall, it is not a budget shortfall that's been caused by a cut in transfer payments from the federal government. The transfer payments from the federal government for health, for post-secondary education, for social assistance, as the Treasurer knows well, are exactly what this Treasurer had in his budget last spring.

There is a real concern about the budget that this Treasurer will bring in. There is a real budget revenue shortfall, but it is a budget revenue shortfall that's caused because this government has completely failed to predict with accuracy either its expenditures or its revenues.

This government has completely failed to get its expenditures under control. This government has completely failed to get the economy going again in spite of the fact that the Premier talks about things getting better. They refuse to acknowledge that this is an Ontario where there are 10,000 fewer jobs in February 1994 than there were in February 1993. I find it appalling that in the minister's statement he suggests that things are getting better because there are fewer bankruptcies. Since when did economic recovery consist of a slowing in the rate of bankruptcies? If this is economic recovery, there is little hope for job creation for the people of this province.

I am relieved that the Finance minister has indicated that there will be no taxes taken as a way of solving the budget problems the government has. I think he's finally understood, as he looks at his numbers, that after \$3 billion in tax increases, when he's getting \$2 billion less in tax revenue, that's clearly an approach that's not going to work. But I say to the Finance minister and to the Premier and to this government that you cannot stop here today, that you must continue to get your deficit down. Your statement today means that you must take a serious look at your own operations, at your own programs.

Again we say, how can you have been spending money on the IWA with all of its millions of dollars spent to make decisions nobody accepts? How can you have spent millions of dollars on an Advocacy Act that none of its supporters even see as a good act? Can you not find a better way of counting your computers than spending \$4 million?

Government, go back and look at your own programs. Most particularly, if it is going to manage this revenue shortfall, if it is going to get its financial situation under control, this government has now got to look at how it can get the economy of this province truly growing again so that we get the jobs we need.

This announcement clearly indicates that the government is prepared to look at social assistance reform. We as a party will welcome that, since for three and a half years we've had a government that has talked about social assistance reform and has done virtually nothing. We hope that what the minister is saying today is that they are prepared now to work with the federal government, not just to continue to blame it.



But I say again, you cannot have social assistance reform, you cannot give people the support they need to get off welfare and back to work, until there are jobs for them to go to. We have got to get this economy going so people can get back to work.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Responses, the leader of the third party.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Come on, Mike. You can do better than that.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** As the Premier has just challenged me to do, in as constructive a way as I can, I would like to comment on the statement that was just made by the Treasurer.

You know, I find it a little distressing, I find it a little ironic that we are to congratulate the Treasurer for keeping his promise. They've broken so many promises to so many transfer partners in their time in office that it's good news saying, "We told you we'd give you this, and we're actually going to do what we said we're going to do." Has it come to this, where we're to congratulate somebody for not lying?

**Hon Mr Rae:** You were doing so well at the beginning, Mike. The other line was a good one. That wasn't so good.

**Mr Harris:** Has it come to this? Has it come to this, where this is supposed to be the norm, this is supposed to be good news?

**The Speaker:** The leader of the third party knows better.

**Mr Harris:** Has it come to this level in the province of Ontario?

**The Speaker:** The experienced member from North Bay knows better. I ask him to withdraw the remark and to continue with his—

**Mr Harris:** Okay. If the remark offends anybody, I withdraw it.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** Maybe they did lie.

**Mr Harris:** Maybe they did, the Liberals say. I don't know.

But so many promises have been broken. So many commitments have been broken. You promised the transfer partners 1%, 2%, 2%. Then last year you said: "No, it's not going to be that. We're breaking that promise." So now we're to congratulate you, a quarter of the way through the fiscal year, for saying: "We told you this is how you should budget. We told you this is what you should expect to get. Pat us on the back for actually doing what we said we're going to do."

You have broken more promises, you have mismanaged the economy of this province—

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** From a Tory?

**Mr Harris:** That's right—that it has come to this point where we're supposed to congratulate you for that.

What does this mean for transfers to hospitals? What this means is 2% less than last year. You promised them

you would give them 2% less this year than last year. I assume you're saying, "Yep, we're cutting you 2% over last year."

I read the release by the minister. It says, "Responding to media reports that transfers would be cut..." Well, the media reported that because you told them that. This was your trial balloon. This is what you said. Nobody else said that. So you're responding to your own media reports. We're supposed to applaud you for that?

At the end of your press release, you say this: "We have the evidence that our balanced approach is working." You say, "Our balanced approach is working." Your approach and the Liberal approach for the lost decade of this province, your definition of working is half a million people on unemployment insurance, 1.3 million people on social assistance, three credit rating declines.

The two of you, your agenda for the first part and then the Liberals on their own in this lost decade, have taken the deficit of the province of Ontario from some \$30 billion to \$80 billion. You've added \$50 billion worth of debt, three downgrades of the credit rating. I am told privately that you've abandoned the fight on the deficit. You don't think you can win an election if you carry on with that.

I want to tell you that your definition that your approach is working is not a definition that is shared by any of the Ontarians I've been talking to. It is not a definition that is acceptable. I'll tell you that if you don't change course, your definition of success is a 6% definition and that is the extent of it in this province.

1410

#### TUITION FEES

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** I'd like to respond to the announcement on tuition. Mr Minister, I can only say one thing: This would have been an extremely acceptable plan if you had introduced it along with student aid reform. You know that the students in this province are supportive of this government if it increases tuition at the same time as it looks at student aid reform. You should be putting your ministry officials on to the income-contingent loan repayment plan with the federal government, but you should be showing the leadership. We have no leadership in this government.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### TUITION FEES

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Premier. I want to ask you a question about the announcement which has just been made by the Minister of Colleges and Universities. I say to you that thousands of young people and their families are going to be sitting at home this evening feeling a very real sense of despair because of the announcement that has just been made. This announcement is one more blow to young people who are trying to make their way in what is a very tough world.

The minister, in his statement about tuition increases, says, "Post-secondary education matters," and it does. Students who get college and university education are much more likely to find jobs. So what has the policy been of this government for post-secondary education? I

say to you, Premier, that your policy for educating our young people has been to cut funding to colleges and universities year after year, to cut grants and loan support to students, to increase tuition fees by what will now be a shocking 42% during the life of this government.

I ask you, is this the kind of value that you place on post-secondary education, and is this the kind of value that you place on a generation that is facing the toughest economic times we've seen since the Depression?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'll refer that to the minister.

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** What I don't understand about the Leader of the Opposition's question is that it just simply ignores the facts. The fact of the matter is that in the current school year that we're in, 179,727 students are receiving student aid from this government. That's up from 100,000 students in 1989-90, when you were the government. This government is helping more students access colleges and universities than has ever been the case, because we believe in access.

I would like the Leader of the Opposition, for once, to tell us what her position is. Are you suggesting in the midst of the most difficult financial circumstances since the Depression for this province that the deficit should go up or that taxes should go up? What is your position?

**Mrs McLeod:** I had an opportunity to speak to my caucus's and my party's position on post-secondary education when I served as Minister of Colleges and Universities. I well remember this party that is now the government when they were in opposition and I asked them to speak for their policy. Where is the consistency in the policy that they bring to post-secondary education and tuition fees? I remember when we used to bring in tuition increases that were at the rate of inflation and this party opposite considered those increases to be absolutely unconscionable. I remember when the people on the other side of the Legislature used to say there should be no tuition; not a 20% increase but no tuition.

Mr Minister, will you tell us what the policy of your government is and where the consistency of your policy for post-secondary education and for the students of this province is today?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** The leader asked what the policy of this government is. The policy of this government is to increase enrolment at the colleges and the universities and the only way that we can do that is to get more money in the system. Our decision is that it's going to be done this year by tuitions because of the financial problems that the province is in. What I'm asking the Leader of the Opposition is, does she want to freeze enrolment? Does she want to decrease enrolment? If she wants to increase enrolment, how would she fund it? That's the question. Put your policy on the record.

**Mrs McLeod:** At one time in the province of Ontario, there was a commitment to at least increasing student assistance so that access to post-secondary education would not be limited by ability to pay. This minister brings in an announcement of a 20% increase in student tuition with absolutely no real indication of how student

assistance will increase. I cannot believe the sheer gall of the Minister of Colleges and Universities in suggesting that there are more students receiving loans in our colleges and universities today. He knows full well that is because there is no longer grant support and the only route our students can go is to acquire greater debts to get their post-secondary education.

I cannot believe that when we are facing a student unemployment level, a youth unemployment level that is now at 19.8% he doesn't realize that the reason there are more students in colleges and universities is because there are no jobs for them. Surely he realizes that as students look towards a summer when there will not be jobs, they will not be able to afford a 10% increase in their tuition fees. This is an unprecedented tax on the students of this province. How can you justify this kind of unprecedented tax increase?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** The Leader of the Opposition is wrong. The number of students assisted under OSAP in 1989-90 was 100,000; the number in 1993-94 is 179,000, an increase of 80%. I suspect that the reason the Leader of the Opposition doesn't want to put her position on the record is because I have it right here, Critical Issues in Post-Secondary Education, Liberal Party, January 1994, "Tuition Policy." Let me read it. "In order to reasonably assess the issue of student tuition fees, we must first determine the proportion of cost to be borne by the province and the student, respectively. The notion of zero tuition is not something that can be considered in light of the economic situation."

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** No, no, you have no jobs for students.

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Cooke:** Let me finish. Here is the zinger: "Students must contribute to the cost of their education." The policy of the Liberal Party? "The question is: how much?" What's the answer? Where's your policy?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

There was a point of privilege which escaped my eye at the moment. The member for York East with his point of privilege.

**Mr Gary Malkowski (York East):** I would ask both members in the Liberal and Conservative parties to cooperate a little. Your behaviour is a little unbecoming. Let's have a little smoother communication. You wake up over there and grow up. Be more sensitive to the answers.

**The Speaker:** The member does not have a point of privilege.

1420

#### ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** My question is to the minister responsible for Ontario Hydro. Can the minister responsible for Ontario Hydro confirm that on Friday of this week, two days from now, Ontario Hydro will begin the orderly shutdown of facilities related to its nuclear power program in this province?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and**



**Energy):** In response to my friend from Renfrew North, he is aware that the contract for the Power Workers' Union with Ontario Hydro runs until the end of this month and that we are at a critical stage in negotiations between the union representing the workers and Ontario Hydro management. We are confident that those negotiations will result in a voluntary collective agreement settlement. Both sides are working diligently to bring that about to ensure there is no disruption in service and no work stoppage.

**Mr Conway:** I'm aware of all that. I repeat: Can the minister responsible for Ontario Hydro confirm that on or by Friday of this week, two days from now, the giant utility will begin an orderly shutdown of facilities related to its nuclear power plant? By that I mean the non-generating facilities: the tritium processing plant out at Darlington and the Bruce heavy water plant. That orderly shutdown will begin on Friday. Can he confirm that?

Can he further confirm that by Monday morning of next week, now less than five days from this hour, the giant utility Ontario Hydro will begin an orderly shutdown of all its nuclear power plants in this province, which power plants last week produced over 70% of the electrical supply to the homes, farms, hospitals, mines and other places in the province of Ontario?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The member is correct in the percentage that he puts before the House in terms of the generating capacity. He will be aware that as a result of recent court decisions, the nuclear generating workers are under federal jurisdiction. He will also be aware that we are confident and hopeful that there will be a settlement prior to any precipitous decisions having to be made.

**Mr Conway:** A very interesting response, because the minister in that response has indicated to the House and to the province that this situation is now even more complicated than on previous occasions when we faced this kind of deadline.

My question is to the government responsible for the giant utility, the Rae-Wildman government, whose responsibility it is to keep the lights on. The clock is ticking and the orderly shutdown of the nuclear power facilities begins in less than 48 hours. What is your plan, Mr Minister, to keep the lights on so the hospital patients, so the research scientists, so the farmers and the other 10 million people in this province will have some certainty and security that, come what may next week, they are going to have a secure supply of this most vital resource, electricity?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The member opposite raises a question as to what is the plan to be able to ensure the supply of electricity to the people of this province. The plan that all of us support and are working diligently to implement is a negotiated settlement.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Minister of Finance. A year ago next week—we're approaching the anniversary—you announced what has become known as the social contract. You told us that the goal was to cut \$290 million from the Ontario public service government payroll. You also told us, on page 77

of your budget, exactly how much you intended to save in each of the other public service sectors.

Nearly one year later, do you have any idea exactly how much you have saved of your own \$290 million for our own public sector workers and how much the other sectors have been able to save of the balance of the \$2 billion that they were to save? Do you have any idea?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I appreciate the question, because there has been some speculation on the fact that we might be losing some of the targeted savings through the social contract. I want to reassure the leader of the third party that we believe we will achieve the savings, or very close to the savings, that are laid out in the social contract targets.

It was clearly understood from the beginning that while the bulk of the savings would come from compensation in the public sector—and as a matter of fact, we encouraged the fact that negotiations should go on that could change the balance between all public sector compensation savings and productivity savings in the public sector, both the OPS, the Ontario public service, our direct employees, and the broader public sector as well. We think we're going to come very close to achieving the savings that were laid out in the social contract a year ago.

**Mr Harris:** Last week you renegotiated Rae days for the public service union at a cost of \$30 million. Metro child care services will spend almost \$900,000 on replacement workers. Correction officials say replacement workers will cost \$3 million. Patients in towns like Kincardine, where medical clinics closed last week, went to emergency rooms for more expensive examinations. With all this mounting evidence, the truth is that you don't know if savings are actually being realized by the transfer partners.

Will you, as I called for over two months ago, ask the Provincial Auditor to step in to ensure that the social contract is actually saving both the government and Ontario taxpayers and the transfer partners the money that you say it's supposed to save?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I recall having an exchange with the leader of the third party before the standing committee on finance and economic affairs on this very issue. I tried to explain it at that point, but I obviously didn't succeed. Perhaps it's the way I expressed myself. But I want to assure the leader of the third party that when we reduced our transfers to our transfer partners, reflecting the social contract goals, they no longer had that money to spend. If a transfer partner out there, whether it's Metro Toronto or a social service agency, uses some other means, such as a productivity saving, that's fine, their target will already be achieved, because we've already reduced our transfers to them.

It makes no sense for them, quite frankly, to use time-and-a-half overtime. It's not in their own best interests for them to do that because we already have reduced our transfers to them. That's why I can say to you that we've already extracted the money from them and that it's in their own best interests to do as best they can within their budgets, because they have to live within their budgets.

**Mr Harris:** Exactly my point. If, under your legislation, as many of the transfer partners are telling us, they are unable to achieve the 5% savings, they have been given a transfer of minus 5%. Today, you told us that the transfer partners were frozen, that they're going to get the same amount of money. That assumes they can save 5% using your social contract legislation, because you have cut their transfers by 5%. They are telling us they cannot.

1430

We have example after example after example of where your legislation is a barrier to achieving those savings. You have no internal provisions to evaluate the current savings, either for your own \$270 million or for the other \$1.3 billion to the transfer partners. You have no idea how much a wage bubble at the end of the social contract might cost. With your track record on budget predictions and deficit projections, Ontario taxpayers are a little sceptical, and quite frankly, I am a lot sceptical.

On behalf of the public service workers, who are taking home smaller paycheques, on behalf of all Ontario taxpayers, who are demanding more efficient and smarter government spending, will you today ask the Provincial Auditor to audit the sectoral agreements to ensure that the reality of the social contract matches your rhetoric?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** First of all, there will be a fuller accounting of the social contract savings in the budget—

**Mr Harris:** When?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Within the next month, so I don't think there's any need to launch into a major investigation of savings, which we largely know will be there anyway.

It's the first time I've heard the leader of the third party call for what I think was an increase in transfers to our partners out there. I'm not sure if that's what he was saying, but I wanted to—

**Mr Harris:** I'm quite sure that isn't what I said. I said the social contract is not working.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Well, it sounded like that's what it was. A year ago, our transfers to our partners out there reflected the \$2 billion in savings under the social contract, so those savings are already built into the budgets of those transfer partners. That's all that was transferred to them, an amount minus the social contract savings targets for each sector, so I don't think there's any reason to doubt the amount of savings, because they're going to be there.

**Mr Harris:** Savings to you, sure. What about the partners?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I guess this calls for a longer debate, Mr Speaker. It's in the interest of our transfer partners to effect long-term productivity savings. That's the key. At least as important as the compensation savings in the social contract is the need for long-term restructuring of the public sector so we can deliver services more productively and more efficiently and at a more affordable level. That's the big part of the social contract.

#### YOUNG OFFENDERS

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My second

question is to the Premier. During our consultations for New Directions, Volume Three, which is A Blueprint for Justice and Community Safety in Ontario, we travelled this province. We had open house after open house. We had questionnaires. We heard from the public. We were told repeatedly, at every stop, that the federal Young Offenders Act must be reformed.

Today, federal-provincial attorneys general are meeting in Ottawa to discuss just that. This morning on Canada AM, the Manitoba Attorney General said that she wants the act toughened, and that's the message that she has taken to that federal-provincial meeting. Ontarians we heard from agree with that position. However, your Attorney General said on the same show and in the same interview that there were too many incarcerations. She implied that the Young Offenders Act needs to be softened, and that was the message that came through.

Contrary to what the public of Ontario is asking for, contrary to what we recommended in New Directions, Volume Three, is this the message we heard this morning? Is this the message your Attorney General has taken to Ottawa?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I regret that the minister is not here to answer the question. Obviously, she is in Ottawa at the meeting in question. In a spirit of complete candour, I would say to the member that I have not had the opportunity to read New Directions, Volume Three, but I look forward to reading it. And I did not see the interview on Canada AM, as I was otherwise engaged this morning.

I'm going to try not to enter too much into the partisan bantering and just say directly to the honourable member that I think he is doing a real disservice to the minister and to what she said, in terms of the quotation he gave and his interpretation, which I think is completely wrong and most unfair to the minister personally as well as to the government. But I accept that these things are said in a moment of partisan time.

My sense is that there is very strong support in the province for a review of the Young Offenders Act. It's not a matter of entering into clichés about what should be tougher and what shouldn't be. The federal Attorney General has indicated a direction for reform. We look forward to seeing those details and to discussing those details.

I can tell him my own personal view, which I'm reluctant to do but I feel a need to do, is that for some offences I happen to believe there is a clear need for reform in terms of the maximum sentences that can be applied to offenders who are under the age of 18 and over the age of 16.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I happen to think that for very serious offences we need to look hard, as a community and as a society, to see whether that bill is adequate. I also would say to the honourable member, as he's raised a serious question, that I happen to think that throughout the justice system there needs to be a review of whether incarceration is the best route to go in all cases.



**The Speaker:** Would the Premier please conclude his response.

**Hon Mr Rae:** It may be that for some serious offences we may need to be tougher; in other areas, there may be alternatives to incarceration, and I make no apology for that statement.

We have to look at that in a balanced way, but with respect to community safety and with respect to what takes place, I think that yes—

**The Speaker:** Would the Premier please take his seat.

**Mr Harris:** It's too bad, Premier, that you didn't read *New Directions*, because it dealt with a number of the alternatives to incarceration. I think you'll find the document very good, because it comes from people here in this province.

In the first five years after the Liberals introduced the Young Offenders Act, violent crimes by youth increased 30%. We called for two specific measures in *New Directions*, Volume Three, to combat this trend. One was for youth courts to be able to sentence violent young offenders more severely. The second was for young offenders who have committed extremely violent crimes to be able to be tried in adult court.

Other attorneys general from across the country have gone to Ottawa with some specific recommendations. Our caucus and our party put forward specific recommendations. As a government, as Premier, does your Attorney General have any recommendations to take to the table?

**Hon Mr Rae:** The Attorney General is armed with a clear mandate from this government to act responsibly and constructively in the discussions of the changes required with respect to the Young Offenders Act. I can assure the honourable member that when it comes to federal legislation, we believe the primary responsibility lies with governments that have been in power in Ottawa for the last 15 to 20 years. Unless my memory fails me, the governments in question were occupied by Conservatives and Liberals, the people on whose behalf you were campaigning so vigorously in the last federal election. Why didn't Brian Mulroney do something about this problem if it's so serious, at some point, at some level, in some way?

If you've got a problem, we're all prepared to deal with it. My understanding is that this is not something to be taken lightly. I would say to the honourable member that the general direction of the kinds of reforms which have been indicated by the federal government I think have the support of most of the citizens of Canada, and they certainly have mine. I can tell you that.

**Mr Harris:** When a young person is lost to a life of crime, I think you would agree with me, Premier, we all lose. Your Attorney General had an opportunity today to help ensure that that doesn't happen by taking a position, by being part of the solution. Obviously, it's not a priority for you. She had an opportunity to bring a position to help strengthen the act, to provide a greater deterrent.

Let me quote to you, Premier, what one 16-year-old Ontarian told the *Toronto Star* in a March 9 interview referring to the Young Offenders Act. "Like, the Young

Offenders Act is like nothing. Everybody knows it's a joke. Like, being a young offender, the only thing that would really suck if you did a robbery and never got caught is if you didn't stash the cash."

1440

That's the attitude many young people in Ontario have towards the Young Offenders Act. When we travelled this province, people told us it was a priority; that not only does crime cost us dollars, but crime and the loss of a young person to a life of crime is a tremendous cost to society, a tremendous burden to themselves. It's a tragic loss as well.

I got the sense from your Attorney General's comment this morning that she has no position, that she was going there in a vacuum, that she didn't know what the people of Ontario thought, and I got the sense that other attorneys general were informed and were representing the people of their province with a new government in Ottawa that needs to hear that. What is the message that your Attorney General took to Ottawa? Can you tell us that, please?

**Hon Mr Rae:** If the leader of the third party in the House is trying to assume that somehow he has a monopoly with respect to a concern about violence or a concern about crime, or if he is asserting for a moment—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** He is saying his document discusses alternatives to incarceration. That's exactly the position that's been taken by the Attorney General with respect to some offences.

**Mr Harris:** What's your position? You've got no position.

**Hon Mr Rae:** No, you don't like the answer I've given you. What I'm telling you and what I'm telling the people of the province is that it is the view of this government and it is my personal view that there is room for considerable reform with respect to the Young Offenders Act. I would say specifically, and I would repeat the answer I gave, that with respect to serious offences there needs to be consideration. That consideration is apparently being given by the Attorney General for Canada, as I understand it and as I have heard it being expressed by him, and we look forward to a constructive discussion.

But if there is a responsibility, if there is a gap, surely it is the government that was in power from 1984 to 1992, of which you were such an advocate and supporter. Surely there's some logic in asking, where were you between 1984 and 1992? Where were you?

**Mr Harris:** Why didn't you send Charlie Harnick to represent Ontario? Why didn't you send Bob Runciman?

**The Speaker:** Order, the leader of the third party.

PENSION FUNDS

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** A question to the Minister of Finance that has to do with the upcoming budget and how he's planning to deal with it. We'd like some assurances from the government that you're not planning to load more of the deficit and the

debt into the teachers' pension. The minister will know we passed legislation—at least, the government passed legislation—that allowed the government to actually withdraw cash from the teachers' pension. The unfunded liability in the teachers' pension is right now at about \$8 billion. It is going, as the minister knows, to almost \$14 billion. In spite of that, the government already is taking a three-and-a-half-year holiday from making any payments against that. That bill has been passed and that's done.

But I'm looking for, from the Minister of Finance today—because they are planning this with the teachers' pension and the same thing with the public service pension—some assurance from the minister that he is not planning any further additions to loading the debt and the deficit into the unfunded liabilities in the pension plans.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I did notice a story in one of the Toronto tabloids this morning on the whole pension issue. I appreciate the opportunity to clear the air in that regard, because there are no talks going on with the teachers, and there is no intention to do anything more with the teachers' pension fund vis-à-vis withdrawing any kind of moneys from it for any purpose whatsoever.

**Mr Phillips:** I have to weigh the words carefully, when he said "withdraw money." That wasn't my question, and I have a lot of confidence in the Minister of Finance. My question was different. Are you planning any further reductions beyond your planned payments in the upcoming budget?

The reason I ask is this: You can see this unfunded liability, money that the government, the people of Ontario, have 100% responsibility for. The unfunded liability, and this is from the teachers' pension commission, is going up to almost \$14 billion. There's a similar chart for the public sector pensions.

The government, unprecedented, passed a bill that allowed it to take cash out of the pension fund. I don't think it's ever been done before, where with an unfunded liability, money was allowed to be taken out of the fund.

I'll ask my question as specifically as I can. Can the minister assure us that in the upcoming budget you will not be looking at further reductions in your planned pension payments to the teachers' pension and to the public sector pension?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I can assure the member that there will be no actions taken that will increase the unfunded liability of the teachers' fund. That's correct, so the answer to the member for Scarborough-Agincourt I think is clear: No.

On the Ontario public service pension fund, the Ontario public service representatives have for some time now, I suspect even when the former government was in office, been talking to government about sitting down and discussing their pension plan and ways in which there can be joint trusteeship, ways in which they are more involved in the administration of the fund. Those kinds of talks go on all the time.

To answer the member very directly on the teachers' fund, the answer is no.

## TRANSPORTATION OF WASTE

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** My question is for the minister responsible for the environment. Waste Management of Canada Inc has released a proposal that would see Metro's garbage shipped by rail to willing host sites in Ohio. This proposal would give the municipalities in the greater Toronto area an alternative to the three superdumps that are now going to be proposed by your Interim Waste Authority for Vaughan, Durham and Caledon.

Under Bill 143, as you know, you do not allow municipalities to ship waste beyond their borders, but WMI has shown that you, the province of Ontario, can't stop the private sector from shipping its waste to the United States. You, Minister, as a result of this, have lost control of your agenda with respect to waste management in the province of Ontario. The best you can do, at least from recent reports, is to ask the federal Minister of the Environment to tax garbage that's leaving Ontario. That seems to be your only plan.

Minister, are you prepared to admit that Bill 143 is not only inconsistent but unenforceable and should be repealed?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** The answer is no, no and no.

The member should be aware that under the previous federal government the borders were opened for the export of waste to the United States. That was a most regrettable decision taken by the Mulroney Conservative government. This government campaigned very hard against that. I met with both the previous ministers of the Environment at the federal level and asked them to move to close the border. Neither one of them took any action. I've also met with the current Minister of the Environment at the federal level and asked her to take similar action.

The reference to taxing was as an interim measure to deal with the particular kinds of issues the member refers to in the meantime, before the federal government actually takes its responsibility in hand and closes the border.

**Mr Tilson:** The problem, Minister, is that you've got an inconsistent policy. You've admitted that today in this House. You've allowed a double standard in the province of Ontario with respect to waste.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** No, the feds have.

**Mr Tilson:** I'm sorry; you have, Mr Minister. Hundreds of tonnes of garbage, as you know, are being shipped privately to the United States every year. You refuse to allow municipalities to operate under the same rules as private enterprise. Why won't you throw Bill 143 out, as you obviously can't enforce it, and allow the greater Toronto area to explore all the alternatives that are available to it, the technology that's available, with respect to waste disposal in this province?

1450

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I think the member is ill informed in that he should know there are differences in the management of municipal domestic waste and industrial-commercial waste throughout the province. That's not a



new situation. What is new is that we are now facing a proposal, a commercial proposal, to transport waste on a commercial basis on an ongoing basis to a site south of the border because the federal government has ignored the fact that many, many transportation companies have been transferring waste south—

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** Are you in favour or aren't you?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I'm not, and I've told the federal government it should close the border. How simple is that?

#### ONTARIO DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** My question today is to the Minister of Health. I've had this little document come into my hands, Madam Minister, and it's from the member for St George-St David. It says that he's fighting for everybody; he's fighting for seniors. As a senior, I perked up when I read that. I said, "Holy smokes, here we've got a member who's fighting for seniors." Then he goes on to say,

"Some of the measures taken by the current government:

"...introduction of user fees to the Ontario drug benefit plan" for seniors.

Madam Minister, have I been asleep at the switch somewhere? Like, don't I know? Is this true?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** Let me assure the member that he has not been asleep at the switch. In fact I know of no member in this House who looks after the interests of seniors better than the member who's raised the question with me today, and I'm sorry the member for St George-St David isn't here so I can set the record straight, because I think the kinds of statements that have just been quoted are exactly the kinds of statements that sow fear and concern in the minds of seniors across this province.

Let me assure the members of this House that there are no user fees for the Ontario drug benefit plan. In fact the Ontario drug benefit program pays the full cost of about 2,300 prescription drugs for our 1.2 million people who are eligible for that plan. Our government is very proud of that and continues that plan.

**Mr Mills:** I'd like to thank the minister for that answer. It sets all the seniors straight. I think it's absolutely diabolical that someone should send this out, and I think there should be a retraction. There should be someone send this out and say, "What I said is a complete"—I'm not going to say it's a lie because I'll get slung out. But they should retract this terrible statement. I thank you, Madam Minister, and I think the seniors deserve better than that from those people.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** Let me say to the member very clearly that I do agree that the newsletter to which he has alluded is fiction, it is not fact, and everybody in this province over the age of 65 gets and will continue to get their drugs paid for without any user fee.

#### NATIVE HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora):** My question is to the Minister of Health. I rise today on behalf of the residents

of Red Lake, Ear Falls, Golden and remote communities to the north of these.

Minister, these folks are totally frustrated with your refusal to address the legitimate concerns of physicians who staff the emergency department at the Red Lake Margaret Cochenour Memorial Hospital. For over 18 months now, the physicians in Red Lake have been in discussions with your officials and political staff regarding the issue of fee-for-service compensation for doctors covering emergency services in this hospital. Minister, you will recall that doctors staffing the hospital feel they are being financially penalized because of the current system. As a result of this government's inaction, the five doctors who work at the Red Lake hospital's emergency department informed the minister, the hospital board and the communities months ago that they will not provide emergency coverage past March 31, 1994.

Please inform my constituents what arrangements you have made to ensure that emergency medical coverage continues past this deadline.

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I'm really glad to have an opportunity to respond to the member's question, and I'm aware of his statement to this House yesterday about an issue that is of real concern to me, to the ministry, and I know to the constituents and the residents of Red Lake.

But let me say to the member that the facts are this. There are five doctors serving the population of around 6,000 in Red Lake. Those doctors want more money for the services they provide. This government negotiated with the Ontario Medical Association, which is the bargaining agent for all of the physicians in the province, to pay the province's 20,000 doctors \$3.8 billion on fee-for-service in this fiscal year. That means that within that amount of money, the Ontario Medical Association, through its schedule of benefits, determines how services are paid for.

The doctors in Red Lake want more than that. I believe that within that \$3.8 billion there is sufficient to compensate those physicians for their services. The doctors are threatening to withdraw their services and the hospital is threatening it could close. That cannot be allowed to happen; I would completely agree with the member.

My ministry has been working with the hospital, with the doctors and with the Ontario Medical Association to make sure the doctors maintain their obligation in exchange for the privileges which they receive, which is to function out of that hospital. That's their responsibility, and we will do whatever we can to make sure they live up to it.

**Mr Miclash:** As I stated, the residents of these communities are facing the closure of their emergency department and possibly the closure of the hospital if the remaining two days of negotiations between the OMA, the Ministry of Health and the local physicians are not successful.

I will be attending a public meeting that you too have been invited to tomorrow evening in Red Lake. Again, what information will you provide me with that I will have to alleviate the concerns of my constituents?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I would be very glad to have officials of the ministry meet with the member and provide him with background and briefing, and the ministry will be represented at the meeting in Red Lake on March 24. I want to assure him of that.

But let me also say to him that that hospital has a responsibility to ensure patient care, just as the physicians have a responsibility to make sure that if one or another of them chooses to withdraw their services, they maintain coverage and provide coverage in emergencies. I would remind the member that just yesterday we saw from the Ontario Medical Association advertisements in our papers saying that emergency services will be maintained at all times.

The College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Ontario Medical Association have a responsibility to make sure they live up to that part of their contract, and we certainly believe that is what they ought to do.

#### MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES POLICIES

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Minister, in every land use policy that you have put forward, there has been a total lack of consultation with those affected.

Your wetlands policy renders private property worthless without any consultation with the owners. With the Madawaska highlands, you set aside protected areas that local residents do not want. The wilderness zone in Algonquin Park killed 340 badly needed jobs in Braeside. None of these policies has been implemented with the advice or consent of the public. Do you have any real plan to consult the people affected by your land use policies?

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** I want to answer the member's question, but first I think I should set him straight on a little history.

The current wetlands policy was in fact developed over 10 years by three separate governments, and the party which he speaks for was at the starting end of the wetlands policy. So I think he might want to check the history to determine that in fact there was a 10-year development policy.

1500

Secondly, the member mentions the Madawaska highlands. The reality is, there is an advisory committee right now made up of a number of citizens of the Madawaska highlands area who are participating in developing some recommendations regarding land use in this most important and I would say very beautiful part of eastern Ontario.

Thirdly, a wilderness zone in Algonquin Park was first proposed over 20 years ago, a wilderness zone for the eastern side of Algonquin Park. In fact, the prospect of a wilderness zone on the east side of Algonquin Park went through something like a four-year review policy by the Ontario provincial parks review committee.

**Mr Jordan:** The policies that you refer to going back a number of years are not the extended policies and the extended areas that we're looking at today. You've made a completely different picture—

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** They were the result of consultation where the public showed that they wanted it extended.

**Mr Jordan:** No, they're not, I'm sorry.

I have a letter from the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters which clearly demonstrates the value of this minister's public word and the absence of real consultation. On January 20, 1994, on the television program *The Angler and Hunter*, the minister stated: "It's not in our mind to create a new series of parks which prohibit hunting, which prohibit the use of outboard motors. We see a continuum of new ways to protect those areas."

Again, on February 25, at the OFAH conference the minister reaffirmed this commitment in front of 300 people. Then on March 9, the minister proposed 17 areas under his *Keep it Wild* program, which will ban hunting and small outboard motors on more than 90% of the 160,000 acres of new parkland. He's going to ban the hunting and fishing; he's going to ban the outboard motors.

I find it very difficult—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jordan:** —to assign any value to the minister's so-called consultations when the minister does the exact opposite to what he says.

**The Speaker:** Would the member please place a question.

**Mr Jordan:** Let me quote from this letter. "It is clear that you intend"—

**The Speaker:** Order. Could the member please place a question.

**Mr Jordan:** Can the minister please explain why he said one thing to the federation of anglers and hunters and then turned around and did the exact opposite?

**Hon Mr Hampton:** Again, to correct the member, in fact the Ministry of Natural Resources over the last few years has had a number of successful consultations and cooperative efforts with the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. In fact, one of the first, and I believe it will be a historic agreement, dealing with aboriginal fishing, was worked out with the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, and I'm speaking of the Anishinabek fishing agreement, something that I think the whole province can be proud of.

This year as well, in a process that took over a year and a half, the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters worked with the Ministry of Natural Resources on some very important fisheries improvement and fisheries conservation issues in northwestern Ontario.

To say somehow that we are not working with, not consulting with, these organizations I think is just not correct.

Finally, the member is incorrect again. Under the *Keep it Wild* program which was announced, we have created a new type of conservation and protection category, that being a conservation reserve which will allow, among other things, hunting to continue. So I would hope that the member would in fact read the information before he



stands up to make these speeches.

**Mr Jordan:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In fairness to my constituency, it is clear that you intentionally misled the Ontario federation members.

**The Speaker:** The member knows that he does not have a point of order. There's nothing out of order.

**Mr Jordan:** My constituency is being given the wrong information.

**The Speaker:** There's a point of difference, I appreciate. Would the member please take his seat. There is nothing out of order.

#### ST MARYS PAPER

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** My question is for the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. In Sault Ste Marie, St Marys Paper is a major piece of our industrial infrastructure. There's some anxiety at the moment that the negotiations there are dragging on. Could you give us a status report today?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I can provide some general information at this time. First of all, let me say that we completely recognize the importance of this company to the community of Sault Ste Marie, and that's why we have been actively involved all along in both monitoring and in participating in discussions. Various stakeholders have been at the table; that includes the Stern group, the unions and the banks. There are many issues that have been involved in the negotiations and, as I'm sure you would recognize, the situation is quite fluid and it keeps changing as negotiations unfold.

Some of the good news, I would say, is that recently and publicly the Stern group and the union have both been saying that they expect a successful conclusion to the overall discussions around keeping this as a viable entity through the restructuring. In fact, many of the restructuring issues have already been agreed to—40% ownership by the employees. These things have been talked about publicly.

We remain actively involved and are, I think, at this point in time very optimistic that there will soon be successful negotiations. But I can't actually give you a time frame today in the House.

**Mr Martin:** There have been reports that the government is going to contribute some dollars to that restructuring plan. Are these reports true, and are there any efforts being made to get something for either the government or the workers in return for any investment we might make in that particular company?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I think from the beginning it's been fairly obvious to everybody that if St Marys is to be retained as a viable entity, all of the stakeholders that are there are going to have to participate in some way, including the province. These negotiations are ongoing and they are at, I'd say, a delicate point. There has been no decision concluded at this point about provincial participation, so I can't report to you on that.

I think that the final decision and the negotiations should be concluded soon, and I'm hopeful that I'll be able to give you a full report at that time.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** My question is to the Treasurer, and it concerns the social contract and matters which members are concerned about. In my part of the province, at the Niagara Detention Centre, the government claims that it wishes to save some money through the provisions of the social contract; that is, by applying the social contract to the Niagara regional detention centre, somehow they are saving money. Yet I have the overtime sheets from the Niagara Detention Centre, which in fact show that the way they are allowing people to take their so-called Rae days off is by paying overtime to other people to replace the people who are taking Rae days. Of course, if they are paying overtime, in many cases they are paying more money than a person would normally get.

Could the Treasurer tell me if he is aware of this problem and, if he is, what specific action the government has taken to overcome this problem?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I have heard of these kinds of situations developing. I thought that negotiations had gone on that were resolving this and removing this as a solution to the days off without pay that are mandated under the social contract, so I'm somewhat surprised to hear this information. I'm not suggesting the member's wrong; I'm just saying that I'm surprised to hear it and I would very much like to have the opportunity to pursue it and just see what is going on there.

1510

**Mr Bradley:** I would say to the Treasurer that his colleague from Hamilton Mountain, the minister responsible for Management Board, says it's an old issue, and that is why I thought that perhaps we would have found a solution to it by now. The fact that it's a so-called old issue is no reason why it cannot be raised again.

People are coming to us to say, "We appreciate the fact that the government may be trying to save money," and I'm not being critical of a government looking at every possible way it can to save money. What I'm saying is that in this specific case, where you have detention centres which have to be guarded 24 hours a day, seven days a week, it is impractical to apply the social contract to a detention centre. What is happening in fact is that by paying the overtime, and these are recent dates in this overtime; it goes into the month of March, it is costing you more money to save money.

Have you terminated this practice—you're consulting with the minister beside you—and if not, are you going to terminate the practice of paying overtime to replace people who are taking Rae days?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I certainly was aware that this was going on in some institutions. Having said that, I believe most of us would understand that when there are essential services to be delivered, this kind of glitch would happen in the system from time to time. I don't believe that means the social contract should not have applied to these institutions. I believe there are more efficient and affordable ways of delivering even these kinds of essential services. So I don't think for a minute

that we should back off and say that the social contract doesn't apply to these services.

Also, there is provision under the Social Contract Act for certain services to be declared emergency services, and ways of dealing with that which I won't get into here now. But it's my understanding that while that was indeed a problem, it virtually has been resolved now through negotiations with the union that represents those workers.

#### PETITIONS FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Hugh P. O'Neil (Quinte):** I have a petition here today which I'd like to read. It's a matter that's of real concern to the members of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, and it's been signed by constituents of the Quinte area. It reads:

"To Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the costs of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

#### INFERTILITY

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** I've been asked to table a petition by constituents from all over the province of Ontario and my riding, which reads:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas infertility is a disease which affects approximately one in six couples, or 500,000 Canadians; and

"Whereas treatment of infertility is already a two-tiered system; and

"Whereas delisting of this valuable service will escalate this situation; and

"Whereas patients already pay cyclical fees for services not covered by OHIP; and

"Whereas drug coverage is often very limited; and

"Whereas infertile people are entitled to the same level of health care as the general population;

"We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to continue to list infertility as an insured service under OHIP."

I would like to table that today.

#### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr Robert Frankford (Scarborough East):** I have

a petition signed by many parents, mostly from Scarborough. This was coordinated by Cardinal Leger school in my riding:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the British North America Act of 1867 recognizes the right of Catholic students to a Catholic education, and in keeping with this, the province of Ontario supports two educational systems from kindergarten to grade 12/OAC; and

"Whereas the Metropolitan Separate School Board educates more than 102,000 students across Metropolitan Toronto; and

"Whereas the students represent 30% of the total number of students in this area yet have access to just 20% of the total residential assessment and 9.5% of the pooled corporate assessment; and

"Whereas the Metropolitan Separate School Board is able to spend \$1,822 less on each of its elementary students and \$2,542 less on each of its secondary school students than public school counterparts;

"The undersigned petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act now and restructure the way in which municipal and provincial tax dollars are apportioned so that Ontario's two principal education systems are funded not only fully but with equity and equality."

I'll sign this.

#### SCHOOL FACILITIES

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and it reads:

"We, the undersigned, residing in the review area of the Dufferin-Peel Roman Catholic Separate School Board known as area I East Credit, are greatly disturbed by the inadequacy of school facilities in this area. The plans show that there are at least four Catholic separate schools needed in this area because of released development, three of which are needed immediately; two of those are overdue by at least two years. The present figures show 1,817 students presently exist in this area and that by 1998 the enrolment will be up to 2,346. At the present time, the children from this area are going to seven different schools, some as far away as 13 kilometres from their home. This includes the four-year-old JK students your government is encouraging to educate. To transport four-year-old children this distance is not only unfair but is also causing mental anguish to parents that have committed themselves to buying a home to live in Ontario, a province where you are advocating fairness to all that live there."

This petition is signed by hundreds of very concerned parents.

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas several patients from the Collingwood area are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some



patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in the Collingwood area;

"Whereas the government continues to insist they are studying the problem, even though they have known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in Alliston and Collingwood,

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of Collingwood."

I've affixed my name to this petition.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr David Winninger (London South):** I have a petition signed by many individuals in my riding opposing Bill 56 for the reasons set out in the petition.

#### FERRY SERVICE FEES

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I have a petition from the township of Wolf Island concerning proposed ferry fares.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, are shocked at the provincial government's intention of charging fares on the only link between Wolf Island and the mainland, upon which Wolf Island is dependent. We believe that social and economic costs will be devastating and that the charging of fees on the part of the provincial highway system, to which we all contribute through taxes and licence fees, is discriminatory."

I have signed the petition.

#### FOREST INDUSTRY

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario.

"Whereas Columbia Forest Products Ltd bought G.W. Martin Lumber Ltd with the assurance that the Ministry of Natural Resources incorporate the right of first refusal clause in selected supply licences from traditional sources that had supplied G.W. Martin;

"Whereas the Ministry of Natural Resources is revoking these rights effective March 31, 1994;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ministry of Natural Resources reaffirm Columbia Forest Products Ltd right of first refusal clause in selected supply licences from traditional sources that had supplied G.W. Martin."

This petition is signed by some 742 constituents, primarily in the Mattawa and Nipissing area of the riding of Parry Sound, and I agree, and I have affixed my signature thereto as member.

1520

#### HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** I have a petition here that's signed by 1,600 residents in my riding from the town of Blenheim, the villages of Erieau and Erie Beach, the townships of Harwich and Raleigh, as well as

adjacent communities in the county of Kent. It reads:

"We, the undersigned, residents of the province of Ontario, respectfully petition the Parliament of Ontario to provide assistance in the securing of the necessary number of family practitioners to supply adequate medical services in our community."

I agree with the petition and also attach my signature.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** I have two petitions which I'd like to present today. Both of these petitions are signed by hundreds of my constituents in Renfrew North. These petitions are identical and they read as follows:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and may include sadomasochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe that all such references to sexual orientation should be removed from the Ontario Human Rights Code.

"Therefore, we request that this House refrain from passing Bill 45."

I've indicated to these petitioners that I do not, as their local member, intend to support that private member's bill.

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas several patients from the town of New Tecumseth are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments in Orillia or Toronto;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in New Tecumseth and one patient is forced to pay for her own nurse;

"Whereas the government continues to insist they are studying the problem even though they've known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP

Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in New Tecumseth and Collingwood;

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of New Tecumseth."

I've signed that petition and it joins really thousands of constituents in the riding of Simcoe West and the surrounding areas who have submitted similar petitions to this Legislature.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Gary Wilson (Kingston and The Islands):** I have a petition opposing the Liberal member's Bill 45. It's to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas traditionally it has been accepted that covenanting together for life of a woman and a man who, together in love and faithfulness, raise children is essential to the long-term health and viability of any society;

"Whereas the right to express convictions regarding issues open to dispute on moral grounds, such as sexual behaviour, should not be prohibited by the Human Rights Code,

"We oppose Bill 45 that deletes the words 'of the opposite sex' from the definition of 'marital status' in subsection 10(1) of the Human Rights Code and Bill 56 that may allow legal actions to be launched against any person or organization that differs with any other people's sexual preferences."

There are 25 names on this petition from people in my area.

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** I have a petition signed by many residents of my riding which reads:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, but since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all references to sexual orientation should be removed from the Ontario Human Rights Code and Bill 45.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

I support this petition and have affixed my name to it.

#### ONTARIO FILM REVIEW BOARD

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas the Ontario Film Review Board, at its May 6, 1993, policy committee meeting, decided to loosen the guidelines for films and videos for Ontario; and

"Whereas the loosening will result in permitting some very gross and indecent acts in films and videos; and

"Whereas these acts include bondage, ejaculation on the face and insertion of foreign objects; and

"Whereas the aforementioned acts are not in any way part of true human sexual activity but rather belong in

textbooks for case studies of deviants; and

"Whereas these activities not only violate community standards but parts of the Canadian Criminal Code;

"We, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon the Ontario Legislature to cancel the new policy resolution of the Ontario Film Review Board and dismiss the chairperson, Dorothy Christian, from her position for her lack of sensitivity towards Ontarians and for being more dedicated to represent special-interest groups than the taxpayers of Ontario."

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** I have a petition to the Premier, Bob Rae, and Health Minister Ruth Grier.

"We, the undersigned residents of a long-term care facility in Ontario, spouses and other family members, friends and interested parties, need your help.

"Many couples whose combined income is needed for the spouse in a long-term care facility and the spouse still residing independently in the community will be unable to continue paying the new rates which were recently increased up to 41%, or \$376.18 per month. Single and widowed residents are also affected by increases.

"Also, we believe the cutbacks in nursing staff positions and part-time nursing hours this year may have and may continue to jeopardize the health and wellbeing of residents in long-term care facilities, and as a result, more health care dollars may have been needed or may continue to be needed to cover any repercussions from these cutbacks.

"We are proud Canadians and desperately need your help regarding these two serious matters."

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** I have a petition signed by many residents in my community—

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** Is it about the courthouse?

**Mr Callahan:** No. I have no comment on that. I'm quite proud that it's named after him and his father. They were great Canadians, great Ontarians.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** And the petition?

**Mr Callahan:** I'm sorry, Your Honour.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Callahan:** No, thank you.

It's addressed to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 55"—that's Mr Cousens's bill, isn't it, Mr Speaker; that's Mr Cousens's bill; that's amazing—"would make it illegal, with fines up to \$50,000, for people to make any public statement, written or oral, which ridicules, demeans or discriminates against a person on the grounds of sexual orientation, still undefined. This is a grave threat to the free speech in a democratic society.

"Mr Cousens's Bill 55 is also an attack on freedom of those religions which do not condone homosexuality—



Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Baha'i, Christian etc.

"We want to maintain our basic right to disagree with homosexuality, which in no way should be equated with hatred.

"We have moved away from the position where some homosexuals and other special-interest groups are no longer content to express their ideas, but demand that contrary views be suppressed with stiff penalties." Mr Cousens's bill has that, I guess.

"At the same time, these special-interest groups will be allowed to teach their controversial alternative lifestyles to youngsters in the classrooms, thereby proselytizing children with their viewpoints without allowing for differing opinions." That's certainly not what he told Christopher Thomas on CBC. It's amazing.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Mr Cousens's Bill 55."

What an amazing thing. It's signed by many residents from my community.

#### STATUS OF BILL

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: On Monday, as we had reports of committees being returned to the House from the intersession, Bill 62 was reported and the question was asked whether or not it be referred to third reading. I had asked that in fact it go to committee of the whole until we had our caucus meeting and had an update on the events of the committee hearings. It is the position of the Liberal caucus that Bill 62 should proceed to third reading. I want to make it very clear indeed that the Liberal caucus would like to move Bill 62 now into third reading if that is agreeable with the rest of the House. I'm not making the motion but just advising, for a point of information, the House that this is our position in that regard.

1530

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mrs Marland from the standing committee on government agencies presented the committee's 17th report.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Does the member wish to make a brief statement?

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** No, Speaker, I do not have any statement.

**The Acting Speaker:** Pursuant to standing order 106(g)11, the report is deemed to be adopted by the House.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### CITY OF BURLINGTON ACT, 1994

On motion by Mrs Sullivan, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr83, An Act respecting the City of Burlington.

##### NORTH TORONTO CHRISTIAN SCHOOL (INTERDENOMINATIONAL) ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Harnick, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr93, An Act to revive North Toronto Christian School (Interdenominational).

##### EDEN COMMUNITY HOUSE OF TORONTO ACT, 1994

On motion by Ms Akande, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr99, An Act to revive Eden Community House of Toronto.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

##### STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

##### LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI CONCERNE L'AIDE SOCIALE

On motion by Mr Carr, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 144, An Act to amend the Family Benefits Act and the General Welfare Assistance Act / Projet de loi 144, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations familiales et la Loi sur l'aide sociale générale.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Would the member for Oakville have any comments with regard to his bill?

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** Very briefly, the bill amends the Family Benefits Act and the General Welfare Assistance Act to provide investigators with adequate powers to obtain information relevant to determining the eligibility of persons for the assistance under those acts.

##### TUBERATE HEAT TRANSFER ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Huget, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr86, An Act to revive Tuberate Heat Transfer Ltd.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### FINANCIAL SERVICES

##### STATUTE LAW REFORM AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

##### LOI DE 1993 PORTANT RÉFORME DE DIVERSES LOIS RELATIVES AUX SERVICES FINANCIERS

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 134, An Act to revise the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act and to amend certain other Acts relating to financial services / Projet de loi 134, Loi révisant la Loi sur les caisses populaires et les credit unions et modifiant d'autres lois relatives aux services financiers.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** We are resuming the adjourned debate, and I believe there are further speakers in this debate.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** It is with quite a bit of pleasure that I have the opportunity to participate in this debate. Most members of the House would know that Bill 134 deals with two specific sections, one dealing with caisse populaires and credit unions, and the other dealing with life insurance reform. Both of those changes, I would say, have been long-sought-after on the part of all those concerned within those industries.

I'll deal first of all with the credit union act and then I'd like to make some short comments on the life insurance act, based on conversations I've had with people in my riding as well as people within the province itself.

Without doubt most members would agree that credit unions and caisses populaires play a very important role in the province of Ontario, and have played a very

important role in giving individuals the ability to develop a certain amount of security in dealing with their financial matters over the past years.

Vous allez savoir, par exemple, que les caisses populaires dans la province de Québec jouent un rôle très important. Ça se trouve une des plus grosses institutions, la plus grosse institution dans cette province, et ce n'est pas arrivé au Québec par accident. C'est arrivé parce qu'il y a eu certaines directions prises par le gouvernement du Québec des années passées qui ont dit, «Écoutez, c'est très important qu'on soit capable de mettre en place des règlements qui donnent un certain pouvoir aux caisses populaires pour qu'elles puissent faire une compétition égale aux banques.»

Ce qu'on essaie de faire ici dans la province de l'Ontario, c'est donner aux caisses populaires et aux «credit unions» les mêmes droits qu'on trouve présentement dans d'autres juridictions quand ça en vient aux banques elles-mêmes.

Vous allez savoir, Madame la Présidente, comme les autres députés de cette Assemblée, que présentement une caisse populaire ou bien une «credit union» n'a pas le droit, par exemple, de faire des emprunts importants ou des sommes assez importantes dans le secteur du commerce. Elles n'ont pas cette possibilité-là.

Par exemple, il y des limites au montant d'argent qu'on peut prêter aux individus. Il y a des limites faisant affaire avec les produits qu'on peut vendre dans une caisse populaire ou les produits qu'on peut vendre directement au public, comme des REERs, de l'assurance et beaucoup de produits qu'on peut acheter présentement dans d'autres institutions financières dans la province de l'Ontario.

Ce qu'on va faire avec les changements de cette loi et l'introduction de cette loi, c'est donner aux caisses populaires et donner aux «credit unions» la capacité de faire compétition directement avec les banques de la province de l'Ontario et la capacité de faire des services égaux à ceux qu'on peut trouver dans d'autres juridictions quand ça en vient aux caisses populaires elles-mêmes.

Spécifiquement, on va être capable de donner le pouvoir aux caisses populaires, par exemple, d'utiliser leurs fonds, qui sont assez importants — on parle de 12 milliards de dollars dans la province de l'Ontario dans ces institutions-là — vers le développement économique d'une communauté à travers des emprunts dans le secteur du commerce, quelque chose qui est très difficile présentement pour les caisses.

On va aussi donner le pouvoir à ces caisses d'établir ce qu'on appelle «community investment shares corporations», qui donnent la possibilité d'investir l'argent de nos caisses directement dans nos communautés dans certains projets ou dans certains commerces dans nos communautés.

1540

Vous savez, mon collègue le député de Cochrane-Nord, une couple d'années passées, a passé une grosse crise dans la communauté de Kapuskasing faisant affaire avec Kimberly-Clark, le moulin à papier. Une affaire qui aurait été bien plus facile dans ce temps-là de transition, c'est

que si la caisse avait eu les pouvoirs nécessaires, elle aurait pu jouer un rôle bien plus important dans la communauté de Kapuskasing, pour établir les fonds nécessaires pour mettre en place certaines mesures pour la compagnie Kimberly-Clark, qui maintenant appartient aux individus de cette communauté.

A number of important changes will affect both the credit unions and the caisses populaires. I'll speak specifically about a couple of them because I think they're fairly important to note. There are two different things and people sometimes get them confused, so I'm going to try to explain.

First of all, we're going to allow caisses populaires and credit unions to set up community investment share corporations. As well, they'll be able to set up community loan funds. People say, "What's the difference between the two?" Fairly simply, it's this.

On community loan funds, basically you allow people within your community to lend money through a vehicle into a particular fund, and you can then take that money and direct it back to local businesses in your community that may otherwise not be able to access capital through regular institutions. The difference is that money invested in community loan funds by individuals will be guaranteed 100% by the provincial government.

This is a very important vehicle, very much in keeping with a number of initiatives this government is taking to develop the kind of system, the kind of network necessary for individuals and small businesses to be able to access capital so we can make our communities' economic base more diversified by giving those small businesses and individuals the ability to get to capital that sometimes is very difficult to happen.

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York):** They're more responsive.

**Mr Bisson:** Much more responsive. The honourable member Mr Marchese—I was going to mention the riding—

**Mr Marchese:** Fort York.

**Mr Bisson:** Thank you. It's one of those Metro ridings. It's a very big place when you live in northern Ontario.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Bisson:** I'm getting relentlessly heckled by my own members.

The point is that this will allow people to invest money into that vehicle and put it right back into the community. Many times all of us on all sides of the House have had people come to us within our ridings and say, "I've been in business for a long time and I need to get access to capital," or "I've got an idea and I want to start up a business to employ myself and other people and help better the lot of our community, but I just can't access that capital." This is another vehicle to allow that capital to be out there so that individuals and businesses will be able to invest.

But what's more important is that we sometimes find caisses populaires and credit unions are much more responsive to individual needs than you'd find in a banking institution. I wouldn't say that banking institu-



tions are not responsive whatsoever, but they clearly have a different mandate to deal more with larger commercial ventures at times, and they sometimes forget to service the needs of the individuals in our communities as well as you can through a credit union. One of the things it will do is allow the credit unions to play a much more important role when it comes to community loan funds.

With regard to the investment share corporation, that is a similar type of vehicle, except that it's higher-risk capital. People will be able to invest shares in a corporation that would be administered through either the caisses populaires or the credit union, and that money would be directed into higher-risk types of investments. There are a number of different examples, if you look around North America these days, of opportunities to do that. This will allow that kind of capital to go to higher-risk, the difference being that the money is invested in much the same way as the money is invested within stock of a company: It is not as guaranteed as what you would have under a community loan fund.

But clearly, it allows you to put money forward to move ahead certain ideas. For example, lately I had the opportunity to visit with the people of Red Lake and Ear Falls. You'd know that in Ear Falls for example, their particular bank decided it was going to pull up stakes and pull out of that community. In a community of 1,104 people, when a bank decides to close up shop and leave a community, it really leaves you in a very desperate situation.

I think a credit union in the long term is where that community would like to go. With the changes we're making to the act, if the people of Ear Falls are successful in pulling together all the pieces necessary to get a credit union going in that community, it will be able to offer services that could never have been offered through a credit union before, and better able to service the needs of the people of Ear Falls, I would say.

I think it would be a lot easier to deal through a credit union, for the local businesses of Ear Falls and individuals, than with a bank. One of the problems with banking institutions is that they're much larger corporations and they tend to deal in areas where the stakes, pardon the pun, might be a little bigger. Sometimes they forget some of the responsibilities within smaller communities. The people of Ear Falls will be well serviced in that community through a credit union, with the changes we'll allow under the act, and will be able to deal with that particular issue.

From discussions I've had with the people of Ear Falls, I certainly look forward to moving ahead on that, hopefully one of these days getting to the point of setting up an actual credit union there. I certainly will work on that with the local member there, from the opposite benches.

The other thing the changes to the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act will do is allow them to sell a broader range of products and services. That's very important. We're very busy people these days in our individual lives. Sometimes we don't have as much time to go out and do the business of banking etc. It's sometimes a little difficult for people to go and do their banking at a credit union, but they've also got to deal,

let's say, with buying insurance at a different insurance company, or dealing with their RRSPs. Under this act, we'll give basically the same kind of powers banks have, when it comes to other services, which credit unions don't have at this point. That really will allow the credit unions and the caisses populaires to expand and play a much more important role in the development of the economic wellbeing of people in communities.

That's always been a real sore spot. From the Caisse Populaire Desjardins in Timmins and the credit unions in both Timmins and other communities in northern Ontario, certainly the message they've brought to me is that it's been very difficult to expand the base of their business when they're limited in the types of services and products they can sell. This is certainly very much welcomed by those particular institutions.

There's another thing we're going to be doing, and I think it's quite significant. People will know, for example, that when you leave money with a lawyer for a particular transaction, the lawyer currently must deposit that money within a bank. There's a sizeable amount of money floating around out there that is a captive market for banks only. One of the changes we're going to do within Bill 134 is to allow the credit unions and the caisses populaires to compete with the banks when it comes to that. If they're able to provide equal service, which I know they're going to be able to do, and probably increase service to a certain extent in terms of the personal touch we can sometimes give in a credit union, they'll be able to attract the business from various lawyers in communities to deposit the money they have in trust. This represents a sizeable amount of money when you look at it. I've been made aware in my time as a member here of a number of issues in regard to my community where people have dealt with lawyers and left quite sizeable amounts of money with lawyers to be left in trust. It expands that capital and the mass necessary for credit unions in the long term, to be able to have the capital to do the lending that needs to be done.

But the most important part of the bill is that it is a modernization of the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act to really bring it into what is happening in today's economy rather than leaving it where it was. When you compare the growth of the caisses populaires and credit unions in other jurisdictions, in western Canada and in Quebec, you find they have played a much more important role in those provinces because they've had the tools necessary to compete with banks, and in some cases have done quite an extraordinary job. Like I say, we're talking large sums of money. Presently, the caisses populaires and the credit unions have some \$12 billion in assets and look forward to being able to increase those assets as time goes on because of the changes in this act.

The other thing this act is doing, maybe the quieter part of the act but equally as important and something that's long overdue, I know the members all across this House will agree, is that we're finally going to reform the portion of the act that deals with life insurance.

1550

People who sell life insurance in this province are

professional people. They're people who want to provide quality services to their customers. They're people who have a financial background, financial experience, to be able to sit down with people like you and me to be able to make some decisions about how we invest our money and how we deal with those investments.

Unfortunately, what's happened over the years is that there have been some people in the industry who haven't had a very good perception on the part of the public. Part of the problem has been that there really has never been a good mechanism to deal with the issue of making sure there is a good code of ethics within the life insurance industry and a good system to be able to make sure that the people within the industry are competent and up to date with all of the changes that are going on within the industry.

I know companies in my community, such as Prudential and other companies that I deal with—I'm going to stop naming companies because I'm going to miss one and I'm going to get a call from maybe somebody like Rick Chartrand who'll say, "Hey, you didn't mention my company," so I'll stop at that point. The point is that most of these companies have excellent training programs when it comes to making sure that their people who are out there selling their products have a good knowledge and a good understanding of the products out there.

But I think we need to go a little bit further. I had the opportunity recently to be invited to a life insurance underwriters' meeting, I guess some time back in February, where I had an opportunity to exchange with the agents in my community, the community of Timmins and surrounding areas, to be able to talk about what this act was all about.

We had a nice opportunity. We had somebody in from their Ontario association. We had a question-and-answer session that was set up where the life insurance people from my community were able to ask questions of both myself and the person from the association. I must say that they were extremely pleased at the end of that dialogue to find out just how comprehensive the changes are to this act.

It's going to do a couple of very significant things. Just to go through them very quickly, the first thing we're going to do is to deal with the question of licensing. I think licensing is a necessary step to have in order to be able to make sure that we have the highest possible standards when it comes to the ability of the people in the industry to do their job. We want to make sure there's no doubt that the people out there are the best possible people to provide the service, and one of the ways we do that is that we need to provide good licensing.

Now, there's going to be a change to the licensing process, where we're going to have a two-step licence. The first part of the licence is when a person first enters into the field and will only be able to sell products of the company that he or she is working for. So if I'm working for Mutual or for Prudential or for one of the other companies, I would only be able to sell those particular products.

But after a period of time, and after testing and after some training and some studies, I would move on to the

second part of my licence, which would give me the ability as a life insurance salesperson to be able to sell products of another company once I get that second licence. What that second part of the licence will say is that I am fully knowledgeable about all of the products that are out there and that I can properly inform my client, I can show the range of choices when it comes to products, that I am very knowledgeable on those particular products that are out there, so that the client I am trying to represent and the client I'm dealing with can be assured that there is a standard of excellence when it comes to the person who's sitting before them, normally at the kitchen table, some Friday afternoon or Friday evening, the late hours that these people have to work—much like the job of MPPs, I might add. We have that ongoing joke with my friends in the insurance industry.

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** Do you have friends in the insurance industry?

**Mr Bisson:** Yes, I have a lot of friends in the insurance industry, actually; very good friends.

So what will happen is that the high level of standard because of the licensing will really, I think, put the client at ease to be able to be more confident in the ability of the person who's sitting in front of him or her.

What we'll do is that as you're sitting down and as you're going through the dialogue of the person saying to the agent, "Well, this is how much money I have and this is how much I can invest," the agent will be able to offer products sometimes that he may never have been able to offer under the present regulations. Presently it is very difficult sometimes to be able to offer products of another company because of rules within the company itself and within the existing legislation.

What this will do is allow insurance sales people to be able to say, "Listen, there is a product out there. I don't have it with my company, company X, but there's another company out there that has a product that would really suit your needs to a T, and I would recommend that you purchase that particular insurance," rather than having to try to sell somebody another insurance that may not be as good because they have to sell the product from their own company.

I think this will give clients and investors out there a much, much better ability to have a much greater view of the products that are out there. That's one of the very important things, that the insurance sales people will have the ability to deal with selling products that are not just from their own company.

The other thing we're going to be doing with regard to the legislation is that when an insurance person will go in to sell, let's say, not a new product but a replacement product—this is a little bit of a dicey issue to some because there are two sides to this one, but I think overall this has been a pretty good approach that we decided to take in consultation with the industry. Let's say, for an example, my good friend Mr Owen is my client. He bought a particular insurance product from, let's say, another company somewhere down the road a few years back but, for some reason, that particular agent never serviced the needs of Mr Owen as well as they should have done, and that sometimes happens.



I happen to come along because I know Mr Owen and I say, "Listen, maybe we should sit down and have a bit of a chat about the products that you have and what we're able to do to be able to service your needs." One of the things that'll happen under the changes to the act that we're making—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bisson:** I did say "Owen," didn't I? Owens—oh, put the "s" at the end. I always call him Steve; it's not my fault.

**Mr Owens:** It's better than what other people call me.

**Mr Bisson:** It's better than what other people call him, I must say.

**Mr Robert Frankford (Scarborough East):** A truly wonderful human being.

**Mr Bisson:** Yes, truly wonderful. We are allowed to have a bit of fun sometimes in debate.

One of the things that it's going to do—it'll simply do this here: If I try to sell my friend Steve a policy, I have to compare that new policy to what his original policy was, so that clearly there's no question I'm selling an inferior product. We need to make sure that if people upgrade their products, they're clear in their minds and we know for darned sure that the product they're about to replace with a new one is going to be as good as or better than what you initially had.

I've been told stories by people I know in the industry who talk about particular cases at times, and this doesn't always happen, but where somebody sold the product to a client, let's say, five, six years ago, and the agent, for whatever reason—maybe that agent is no longer with the original company who sold the product to the person—has not really kept up with the person's changing financial situation. What has happened is that particular person has really not been getting the biggest bang for his or her buck in the investment portfolio that has been established. What this will do is it will allow other agents to sort of keep an eye on that and to make sure that indeed we're all out there making sure we protect the best interests of our clients and at the same time that we keep our clients satisfied with regard to making sure that their investment decisions are kept current.

One of the things I think this legislation will do is really put an onus on agents to make sure that happens. But in the event that the person decides they want to change agents, they would have to be given a comparator to the original policy they had, what it's worth and what its dividends would be in comparison to the new one that's being sold so that you can't fool anybody when it comes to how you replace. Then what would happen is that the new insurance agent would then send a notification to the old insurance company that originally sold the original product that that's been done in order to give the other company the opportunity to say, "Well, hang on a second; did we really do our jobs?" It really, I think, takes a lot of the bantering around that sometimes goes on now.

The other thing that's really important, and I've left this to the last part, is that one of the things we've done in this bill is we're establishing a process by which life

insurance agents will not only become licensed and have a much better licence, but they will become a self-regulating body. What that will mean to say is that life insurance agents themselves will become responsible, somewhat like other professions such as lawyers and doctors and engineers who are in self-regulating bodies, to be able to administer a code of ethics, to administer the rules by which life insurance agents operate within the province of Ontario. I think that really raises the stature to a certain extent of life insurance people in this province.

I said at the beginning, when we started talking about this whole thing, that people in the life insurance business sometimes have a pretty tough row to hoe. Sometimes we view life insurance sales people in a negative way because there have been some people in the business who have not been as scrupulous as they should have been. Mind you, they're the minority, but they've really made it a bad thing for other people in the business. It's much the same as MPPs. We've got a lot of good people in this assembly and we've had very good people in the past, but a couple of bad apples sometimes can really tarnish the image of the rest of the people in that industry.

1600

I think by moving to a self-regulating body—I know, because I know the people in my industry back home who work in the insurance industry are respectable people, they're professional people, they're people who believe in the products that they sell, they're people who have very strong moral fibre and want to do right by their clients and they want to do right by their communities—it takes it away from the system where government's going to tell you how you should do it, the Big Brother type of thing, in-your-face kind of situation, to a much better approach, which is, "You're the insurance industry; you understand the needs."

After all, there's no insurance company out there that'll profit by having bad people out there selling products that they're not very conversant with, and I think what it'll do is it'll allow people in the industry to really deal with a lot of issues that have been very difficult to deal with from the outside. I think the people in the life insurance industry will really have an ability to go out there and do things that'll really raise the standard and really raise the profile, more importantly, of life insurance salespeople in the province of Ontario. Because, like I said at the beginning, it's sometimes been a profession or a job that has been somewhat maligned because of a few people out there who happened to have done some pretty nasty things out there.

So I think, in closing, I would want to say first of all that I want to congratulate my counterpart, my good friend and colleague Mr Stephen Owens, who piloted this bill through the consultative process with the communities in the province of Ontario, the caisses populaires, the credit unions and all of the life insurance people I know and companies that he dealt with. I think Steve did a magnificent job of making sure not only that people were listened to but making sure that those comments and suggestions that were made before were brought back to this assembly, into the act, in order to be able to reflect

what it is that we heard out there.

More importantly, I've got to say, I think Stephen Owens deserves a great amount of praise here today because he is the one in the end who really made sure that we as fellow caucus members put this as a priority in this government's spring agenda. I think there might have been a temptation at one point to say there are other bills out there that need to be dealt with. Sometimes House leaders and sometimes cabinet have some of their ideas about bills but I think Steve showed a lot of leadership in coming into the caucus and making sure that this was really a priority for this government in this spring session, and I think Steve deserves a round of applause for the fine work that he did.

In closing, I'd say, l'ouvrage qui a été fait à travers la province de l'Ontario, d'une consultation avec M. Owens, a été très apprécié, je le sais. J'ai eu l'opportunité l'année passée avec mon assistante politique, M<sup>me</sup> Anne Ladouceur, qui j'ai vue dans les parages en arrière quelque part. On a fait des consultations à travers la province de l'Ontario dans les communautés francophones et les groupes francophones, des caisses populaires et des assurances pour être sûrs qu'on comprend leurs besoins pour pouvoir répondre à leurs recommandations. On a fait des tournées dans le bout de Kapuskasing, dans le bout d'Iroquois Falls, Timmins, Ottawa, Prescott et Russell, dans différentes communautés à travers la province de l'Ontario. J'aimerais signaler que c'est a peu près temps qu'on passe cette législation-là à ce point-ci et ne plus prendre de temps sans la passer, finalement.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. We now have time for questions or comments. The member for Scarborough Centre.

**Mr Owens:** I'd like to thank the member for Cochrane South for his very generous comments with respect to the consultation process that was undertaken with respect to credit unions and co-operatives in the province of Ontario. I think, however, he gives me just a little bit too much credit and I think that clearly the credit is due to the hard work of the credit union and the caisse populaire movement, which resolved some fairly significant and fairly long-standing issues that had been on the table for a very long period of time.

I think in terms of the role that the caisse populaire plays in the francophone community, there's absolutely no doubt that it's an important part of the culture, the family, the way the town functions. During my 13-centre co-op/credit union consultation, I had the pleasure of visiting many communities that had the caisse populaire in operation and it's quite fascinating to see the level of organization that goes in and how the caisse is involved in all kinds of aspects of family life within the community.

So I'm quite pleased that my colleague the member for Cochrane South—Madam Speaker, you may not know Mr Bisson was involved with this consultation and with providing the input we needed to the francophone community so we're able to deal with issues within the francophone community in a culturally sensitive and appropriate way.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank Pierre Lacasse

and Michel Paulin, who worked with the member for Cochrane South as well in terms of the caisse populaire contribution to this piece of legislation.

**The Acting Speaker:** Any further questions or comments to the member for Cochrane South? The member for Simcoe—no, Durham-York.

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** Yes, Durham-York. In fact there are a few credit unions in the riding of Durham-York. There's a fine community credit union in Uxbridge and they're quite involved with this. Actually, I've met on a number of occasions with people from there and people from the Markham-Stouffville credit union hoping that this bill would be coming forward.

When my colleague talked about the consultation process, all these people have been involved, and myself, as a member of a credit union, the auto credit union. Of course, coming from Oshawa originally, I belonged to that credit union. They were actually one of the first credit unions around, I think, that had this card where you go in and you got the automatic teller. They call their card the Auto Cash. I guess it's kind of strange. It was developed by auto workers in Oshawa. So the auto workers' credit union—I know I have had on occasion letters from their board saying that they want to see this go forward.

So when my colleague the member from Cochrane talks about these things and the consultation that has taken place, he's quite right. There are a lot of credit unions out there, and they're found in just about every community across the province, right across the north, and the caisses populaires. They're all quite supportive because they're involved in the community. They've got a board of directors that comes from the community. It's time that we actually include them a little bit more in all the different aspects and elements of the services they can provide. That's why I think it's important to support this, and I think that's exactly what the member from Cochrane has been saying. I appreciate the opportunity to thank him for the eloquent way in which he put it. Merci.

1610

**The Acting Speaker:** Any further questions or comments?

**Mr David Wininger (London South):** I too applaud the remarks made by the member for Cochrane South. Practically since I was elected, I've had regular visits, correspondence and phone calls from a credit union, St Willibrord Community Credit Union, in my riding, in fact within a stone's throw of my constituency office. We do all our banking arrangements with them and they offer us very courteous service. But they've been very desirous of being able to compete in this modern financial world and they've been very interested in what this bill does to augment their ability to compete in a very competitive world. I know they're extremely pleased that this legislation is now being introduced and I'm pleased to be able to go back to my riding and let them know the good news and explain anything they may have questions about. I certainly find that the member for Cochrane South has outlined in a very clear fashion many of the initiatives under the bill and many of the improvements that I know St Willibrord will actively welcome.



**The Acting Speaker:** Any further questions or comments?

**Mrs Ellen MacKinnon (Lambton):** I recognize the important role that farm mutuals play in our communities across this province, and have for many, many years. Some farm mutual companies have expressed a concern that credit unions will be able to sell insurance within their branches. I would like to assure you that this is not the case. This bill will only provide the credit unions with a level playing field with their main competitors, the federal financial institutions. This will not give the credit unions any more power at all than the banks and the loan and trust companies have today.

I know that the Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Finance, the Honourable Brad Ward, has met with Ontario mutual insurance associations and local farm mutual representatives and has had the associate deputy minister of Finance discuss their concerns. I and this government will continue to work with the farm mutuals to ensure that they continue to play an important role in this province.

**The Acting Speaker:** The time for questions or comments has expired and now the member for Cochrane South has two minutes to reply.

**Mr Bisson:** I would only say that I want to thank my colleagues and all members in the House for their kind comments, for the attention they paid to this debate. I just want to echo the sentiments of my colleague Mr Stephen Owens that it's really been a lot of work on the part of the credit unions out there, and the caisses populaires and the insurance industry, which have worked very hard to be able to bring this forward, and a credit to their ability to be able to organize a really effective lobby.

One thing I've found in government is that it's one thing to go out and lobby. There are two ways of doing it. You do it to go out and effect change by putting forward constructive suggestions, by finding ways of getting government to do your things in a way that's cooperative, and then there is another type of lobbying which is for political gain.

I've been on both sides of that, so I do understand. I think the credit unions, the caisses populaires and the insurance companies have really been a credit to their industry in the way they've approached this entire consultation. They've been very supportive. They've pointed out problem areas to this government, to myself and to other people who were involved, that they felt needed to be addressed. We didn't in the end deal effectively with every entire issue out there, but on a scale of 1 to 10 this is a 9½. I'm very proud to be a member of a government that has been able to bring forward finally these changes that have been sought after for so many years. With that, I'd like to thank you for my time in this debate.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** I'm pleased to rise and participate in today's debate. As you know, one of the things I try to do when I speak on bills before the House is to use the opportunity to let my constituents in the riding of Oriole know what the legislation is about and

how I feel about it and how I intend to vote.

The title of Bill 134 is An Act to revise the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act and to amend certain other Acts relating to financial services. There are two very significant parts of this bill, and a third is house-keeping, in my view.

The first part of this bill deals with very important changes to credit unions and caisses populaires across the province. For the information of those people watching, Ontario's credit union sector has about 540 institutions with approximately two million members. This piece of legislation could have a very significant impact upon the membership, the future membership and those 540 institutions which serve communities right across this province.

I'd like to spend a minute on that section of the bill and then I'll move on to the other sections. The first section of the bill that deals primarily with credit unions is, as I say, long overdue. It's an important part of financial institution reform in this province and I was disappointed that it took the present government until it was into its fourth year in office, that length of time, to bring forward these amendments and reforms which the credit unions have been asking for and working on with governments, both past and present, for quite some time.

The credit union industry in Ontario has approximately \$12 billion in assets in its care and it has three umbrella groups, sometimes called "leagues." They are the Credit Union Central of Ontario, la Fédération des caisses populaires and l'Alliance des caisses populaires. These three leagues or institutions, these umbrella groups, act as the central bank for their members, who are the 540 credit unions across the province.

Historically in the province of Ontario, credit unions have grown in areas which display a strong local geographic or industry focus. Usually, people buy a certain number of shares in the organization, which allows them to then vote on credit union policy and partake in the institution's services.

Bill 134 updates the existing set of rules governing credit unions and caisses populaires and these rules have not been updated, as I mentioned, for many years. The bulk of the changes in Bill 134 represent changes to how the credit unions will be governed and how it will impact on their membership.

I don't want to speak at length about this, but I would like to make a couple of points. For years, credit unions have been telling government that they were too restricted by government legislation to be able to be competitive in offering other financial services and with other financial service companies. We all know that competition is very good for the consumer. As a result, many of these local institutions, these credit unions and caisses populaires, were unable to expand a financial base that would allow them to provide new services required in the new economy for not only their members but for others in the community.

Bill 134 introduces a number of provisions that would give credit unions expanded powers and would also limit the government's role in monitoring these institutions. In

other words, this is a time of maturity for credit unions. It also means more responsibility for the credit unions and for their members, and it's important that people understand this.

Under the provisions of the bill, the credit unions will be given what's considered neutral person power in deciding what type of investments to make and services to provide. Currently, the government lists the powers of credit unions in the act. The changes will allow institutions, credit unions and caisses populaires to provide services unless they are specifically outlawed by the legislation, so in a way this is permissive legislation. It will allow the credit union industry, it will allow the caisses populaires across the province, all 540 institutions, to grow and develop and mature. I think that is a good thing.

We also know that the bill will allow credit unions and caisses populaires to offer non-voting shares for sale to members of the institution or other interested outsiders, and that is a very new feature and I think we'll have to see how it works. Certainly, at this point in time I'm supportive of that but with the caution that says, "I think, in the name of accountability, we'll have to see how well that works."

I'm not going to go into the details of how a credit union works. Those people who use credit unions, belong to credit unions or caisses populaires, know that. My word of caution for anyone who uses a credit union or a caisse populaire is that they should know and understand the rules governing the institution they're doing business with, because every individual has an obligation to know what they should properly expect in the way of accountability, responsibility and decision-making. I very much believe that we are entering an era where people must take more responsibility and have greater understanding about the institutions they deal with.

As we look at this bill, this is not only a time of maturity for credit unions and caisses populaires; it is also an opportunity for those people who use credit unions and caisses populaires to get better acquainted with and to understand the important role the credit unions and caisses populaires play in our society.

1620

Bill 134 expands the power and the responsibility of the boards of directors of credit unions. Those people who will be serving as members of boards of directors will have greater accountability and responsibility because they will have greater powers that this legislation gives them in its permissive nature.

The bill provides for improved supervision of credit unions with the creation of the director of credit unions. This is an office with broad enforcement powers. While the office will exist, while the credit unions and their boards will be subject to scrutiny—and that's why I said we have to watch and see how things are going to work—I still think it is important for us to realize that we also must take responsibility, those who choose to receive services from any institution, to be familiar with how they operate, what their responsibilities are, what they can do, what they can't do and who the members of the board of directors are. I think it's very important for members

of any organization to become more familiar with who is making decision on their behalf, who's responsible and who's accountable.

The reason I'm going to be supporting Bill 134 and the changes to the credit union act is that I believe this could well mean greater opportunities for small businesses in communities to get access to capital. We know how difficult it has been, particularly through these past few years of economic downturn and recession, for small businesses to access capital. Having a little more competition in the market, allowing credit unions and caisses populaires to offer loans to small business, I believe is one of the initiatives in this bill that makes it supportable.

To do that, the act actually changes the provisions which force institutions such as credit unions and caisses populaires to maintain a certain amount of the financial reserves on a risk-weighted basis. That's an important change so that the more money that credit unions invest in riskier investments, the larger will be the amount of money that the institution must keep in reserve in case of bad debt. While the institutions will be encouraged to make loans in the community, they will also be required to be responsible to their shareholders by having an appropriate size of reserve in case there is a bad debt. That's an important part of this legislation.

There's another provision that I want to make sure people are aware of. Bill 134 establishes provisions that prohibit what is called tied selling. These are complicated sales transactions that I'm not going to go into here in the House today. While the act will allow credit unions to sell products such as insurance, they require that those products be sold in subsidiaries. Credit unions will not be permitted to sell insurance-type products at the same location where the banking and other financial services are offered. But it's important for credit union members to know that those services will be available through subsidiary organizations, through the credit union and caisse populaire movement.

I believe that the changes, as I said, are long overdue. I think they will benefit not only the credit union maturity and establishment and development as a financial institution in this province; I think they will challenge other financial institutions, banks and so forth, by the new competition it allows in the market. Those provisions, as I said, I believe are overdue. We could have seen them a while ago. We know how badly the support and access to capital has been for small and medium-sized businesses. I am hopeful that this will be proclaimed and that the credit unions will get into the business of assisting small businesses in particular with access to capital.

The second part of this bill, which is also very significant and in my view totally unrelated in any way to caisse populaire or credit union organization, is the self-regulatory regime that is proposed for life insurance agents. I think that is worthy of a separate and independent piece of legislation. It is also long overdue.

As a former minister of the crown, I had frequently expressed my support for self-regulatory models where professions, whether they were health professions or others, could then be held responsible and accountable for



the services they provide to the public. So I was a little concerned when I saw what I think is a very important legislative initiative, and that is the development of a self-regulatory regime for life insurance agents which established two levels of life insurance agents, which allows them to sell life insurance for more than one company, which requires examinations and so forth to move from level 1 to level 2. It also, in my view, should be a separate piece of legislation.

One of the things I have objected to on more than one occasion is the desire of this NDP government to put things together that don't belong together. When you do that, you don't allow for proper debate and discussion or, in my view, proper status to the issue that it deserves.

I believe the life insurance agents of the province deserve to have a separate statute that would do many of the things, and perhaps a few more, that are contained in Bill 134, but I think it should have been a separate piece of legislation. Rather than being called An Act to revise the Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act and to amend certain other Acts relating to financial services, it seems to me that you should have had an act which was An Act respecting Life Insurance Agents—or Life Agents, as you call them—in the Province of Ontario.

That would have been an important piece of legislation not only for the life insurance industry in the province, and for agents in particular, but for the public. It's important for them to know how professionals are going to be held accountable. I don't think we've had sufficient discussion in this House about that aspect, because most of the discussion here has been about the credit unions and caisses populaires. I think the life insurance agents were deserving of separate legislation.

I also believe it is overdue. I think it is a profession which is perfectly able and mature enough to be able to accept self-regulation and a self-regulatory model. I'm pleased to see the regime that has been set up, and I believe it is appropriate that we move forward in this way, but I think to hide it and couple it together with a piece of legislation that is totally unrelated does not do justice to the issue.

The third piece of amendment in this legislation has to do with amendments to the Toronto Stock Exchange Act. Quite frankly, I have the feeling that most of them are housekeeping. I have no objection to those kinds of amendments, housekeeping amendments, being included in an omnibus bill.

Having said that, I can't remember a piece of legislation that I ever brought forward to the House, or frankly that our government ever brought forward, that had in it two substantive issues. Yes, there were omnibus bills that contained housekeeping along with a substantive issue, but I can't remember ever putting together two substantive issues in one piece of legislation. We've seen this government do it time and time again on the basis that if you support one, you should automatically support the other.

In this particular case, I happen to support both. In fact, I support all three sections of the act, while I may have some concerns about how it's going to be in the future and how we're going to see the evolution and

development of the need for further amendments. It does seem to me that as a precedent and as a practice, it's a bad idea to couple together two unrelated issues in the same piece of legislation. So I wanted to make that point.

The last point I really wanted to make is that this is a time when my constituents in the riding of Oriole are still worried about whether they are going to have a job tomorrow. We have seen time and again pieces of priority legislation coming forward from this government that really do nothing to give them any sense of confidence or security. We know Ontario is lagging behind the rest of Canada in economic recovery and job creation, and I think that is because the government of Ontario has failed the people of the province by giving them a sense of confidence that the government has a job creation and an economic prosperity agenda.

1630

Frankly, as I said, the issues before us are important to life insurance agents and to credit unions and caisses populaires. I'm not sure they're going to lead Ontario back to prosperity. In fact, I don't think they're related to that at all. If as a result we see access for small business to loans, that is a good thing and I would state that, but by the time this legislation is in place and under way, we will have seen too many bankruptcies of too many small businesses that have been unable to have the access to capital that this kind of legislation, if it had come two years ago or even two and a half years ago, could have been of help to them in getting at that time.

As I conclude, I want to leave everyone with the last bit of insight I have on this legislation. It seems to me that while we are modernizing an important industry, one which is important to the communities they serve, we know that the credit unions and caisses populaires, and life insurance agents, for that matter, have all suffered through this recession. We know that life insurance agents in particular are suffering because of the additional taxes the government placed on their products in certain circumstances, and we know that has hurt the industry very badly.

We know the credit unions and caisses populaires have been suffering as businesses have been going bankrupt and as their membership has suffered through job loss and economic hard times. I don't think this bill is going to correct all of that.

What we need in Ontario is to see action that will create a climate where the private sector will be encouraged to create jobs, to invest in Ontario, to give us hope and prosperity and confidence, and then people will have the money to deposit with credit unions so that this sector will flourish.

I will be supporting Bill 134, but I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that when we see a piece of legislation with 184 pages that most people would find complex and confusing, I wish we could have the opportunity, when there are individual issues, that we could see it brought forth in individual legislation that would make it easier for people to understand. Democracy only works if people can participate, and it's hard for them to participate if the government puts together pieces of legislation that are really deserving of independent

legislation. This should have been two pieces, not one. Notwithstanding that, I will be supporting it.

**The Acting Speaker:** We have time now for questions or comments.

**Mr Bisson:** I just want to comment very quickly. I'm not going to tease the bears today.

The only comment I would make to the member for Oriole is that the reason the act is contained under one omnibus bill, I think you would well understand, is the legislative time we have here in the assembly. To separate the act in the end might have effected the kind of change you would like, and I would concede that point to a certain extent, but you are aware as well as I and other members in this assembly that we have limited time in the assembly. There are only so many bills you can put before the House at any one time within any one particular sitting, and because the government found it very important to move on all three parts, we put this bill under one act to respond to the needs of the people of Ontario.

To say that it should have been two and a half years ago—well, I guess there are a lot of things you should've done in your time in government. You can only deal with so many things, so quickly, according to the time we have in this assembly.

**The Acting Speaker:** Any further comments or questions? Seeing none, the member for Oriole has two minutes to reply.

**Mrs Caplan:** I've been trying, over the time I've been here, to be helpful in suggestions to the NDP government. When they've done something good, I've said I think this is a good thing to do. The only criticism I have of this bill is that it could have been brought in two and half years ago instead of Bill 40, for example. That bill took up so much time from the Legislative Assembly because it was ill-thought-through and created such enormous controversy.

This bill is going through in a matter of days. There is general consensus. When the parliamentary assistant stands and a member of the House stands and tells me, "We put it all together because we didn't have time," I would say to him that the regulated health professions legislation went through this Legislature with the support of all parties and with the kind of facilitation that made that a reality. I would say to him that the only pieces of legislation which take a lot of time are those which the NDP government has brought forward that are not supported, that are not good public policy and that shouldn't be dealt with.

There are so many things you could be doing that would help the economy, that would create jobs, that would give us a legislative agenda to respond to the real needs of Ontario, that when I hear you say to me that there's only so much legislative time, that is a weak and lame excuse of an incompetent government.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate? The member for Leeds-Grenville.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Now for a moderate and contemplated contribution.

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** An

absolutely moderate and productive contribution to the debate from Leeds and Grenville.

We are, in the Conservative Party, generally supportive of Bill 134. I am not the Finance critic for my party, but I felt a commitment to put a number of things on the record related to a few concerns that have been brought to my attention in my part of Ontario, eastern Ontario. Generally, we agree that the bill as structured will modernize some badly out-of-date legislation and bring it into line with current competitive realities in the financial markets and financial services.

One concern that I will be talking about in the few minutes I will take up, as will my colleague the member for S-D-G & East Grenville, Mr Villeneuve, when he has an opportunity, perhaps not during second reading but in committee—we hope this bill will be going to committee. I understand it will be and we support that, but Mr Villeneuve I know has concerns comparable to mine and will have an opportunity during third reading and perhaps in committee as well.

Some of the advocates for Bill 134 have been talking about things like credit unions playing an important role in small, underserved areas where they are often the only financial institution available. If indeed that proves to be the case, that is a critical element of the legislation.

As one who represents a number of those kinds of areas which have seen financial institutions move out over the past 10 years—the federally chartered banks have closed up shop in much of rural Ontario and financial services available to rural Ontarians are at a premium. There are very few options or opportunities available to many residents of rural eastern Ontario, and I assume that probably applies throughout the rest of the province as well.

I want to talk about the question of the mutual insurance operations and the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association. I have an operation that is not in my riding but serves residents of my riding, the Grenville Patron Mutual Fire Insurance Co. It's based in Spencerville, Ontario, and those of you who know eastern Ontario will know Spencerville lies between Prescott and Ottawa, off Highway 16 on the route to Ottawa. This company has been in operation since 1892, serving policyholders for over 102 years.

I met recently with Alton Whitehorne, who's the manager-treasurer of that company, which has served the area so well, so efficiently and so effectively for more than a century, as I indicated. Their concern is that they were given assurances by the government some time ago that in respect of the kinds of changes we see brought forward by the government in Bill 134, they would also apply to farm mutuals. They have very significant concerns in respect to the fact that now that the bill has come forward, there is no provision to recognize the concerns of farm mutuals in this province.

1640

The Grenville Patron, as I indicated, has had an excellent record in the community for over a century. They have excellent management and staff, outstanding people; I think over \$11 million in reserves. These are



financially sound, prudent operations, people who are very cognizant of the needs of consumers and the people they serve, and feel that the timing of changes in respect to what's occurring in Bill 134 is critical in respect to what's happening: the fact that this may, as they see it, afford one group in the financial institutions area a benefit which would create a disadvantage over another group in the financial institutions area. Of course, this is the major concern of farm mutuals.

I want to put a couple of their comments on the record during this time that I'm participating in the debate. The membership in the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association, which by coincidence is meeting in Toronto this week at its annual convention, has endorsed recommendations of a financial services committee which was established in 1990. They have endorsed their recommendations to pursue with the government the necessary changes that would permit farm mutuals to respond to new opportunities and challenges.

Their membership endorsed the recommendations, two resolutions: one related to the possibility of establishing a loan corporation to be owned by farm mutuals so that additional financial services products could be offered to the policyholders of farm mutuals; in other words, for the farm mutuals to either enter into a networking arrangement with a life insurance company to provide customized life products to their policyholders or to establish a life insurance subsidiary which, in turn, would be owned by the farm mutuals. Both of those resolutions and recommendations of the financial services committee were overwhelmingly endorsed by the membership of the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association.

They have taken the time, clearly, to review Bill 134. They didn't want to pursue the recommendations of the committee until there were legislative provisions in place. Clearly, they didn't want to get into these detailed plans and processes unless, of course, there were legislative provisions in place to support any kind of new venture on the part of farm mutuals.

They've looked at the legislation. As I said, they were assured that these kinds of changes would be forthcoming, and they felt that Bill 134 would incorporate their concerns as well and not simply be restricted to credit unions and caisses populaires. So obviously there's significant disappointment within the farm mutual family in respect to the fact that their concerns, their recommendations up to this point have been overlooked. Of course, that's one of the major reasons why the Conservative Party is supportive of this legislation going to public hearings through a standing committee of the Legislature, so that the farm mutual organizations will have an opportunity to present their case to all three parties and members serving on that standing committee, and hopefully have a number of amendments accepted and endorsed by the standing committee.

They have spelled out those recommendations. I don't want to go into detail on all of them, but there's not a significant number of amendments. They're proposing a new section, a change to paragraph 121(1)31, and a change, an amendment to subsection 433(9).

I want to read that one into the record, their proposal

in respect of 433(9), because I think it's important at this juncture. The amendment as proposed by the farm mutual organizations is:

"(a) Despite anything in subsection (1) or section 435, but subject to the approval of the commissioner and such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council"—this is the important part—"a mutual insurance corporation that participates in the farm mutuals' guarantee fund may invest in the fully paid shares of any joint stock financial institution incorporated in Ontario or service corporation if, after the investment, all the shares of the financial institution or service corporation will be owned by one or more mutual insurance corporations that participate in the fund.

"(b) A financial institution or service corporation referred to in clause (a) for the purposes of this act will be deemed to be an affiliate of all of the farm mutuals' guarantee fund members which own its shares."

The other section that I wanted to put on the record, and I won't get into detail, was the new section, which states:

"An insurer may act as an agent for any person in respect of the provisions of any service that is provided by a financial institution, enter into an arrangement with any person in respect of the provision of that service or refer any person to any such financial institution."

The farm mutuals believe that the amendments they are proposing will permit the farm mutual organizations to enter the fields that we've talked about, I've talked about, and they have set out in their resolutions, as well as to centralize functions over time that would be of mutual benefit to the membership of the Ontario Mutual Insurance Association.

The provisions relating to the deeming to be affiliated will address the problems they've outlined in subsections 393(12) and (13), which in the wording presently existing in the act restrict the ability of agents of property and casualty insurers to represent only their company and "affiliates."

The Ontario farm mutuals are and have been for many, many years part of Ontario's financial services industry. They're serving thousands of owners, and I stress "owning," policyholders. They believe quite sincerely that these legislative changes they're proposing, the amendments to Bill 134, are critical and absolutely necessary in terms of the ongoing survival of their industry.

I can't emphasize enough that in our party, we believe the changes recommended by the farm mutuals must proceed simultaneously with the credit union legislation. We do not and cannot support a timetable that will result in credit unions receiving broader powers in advance of farm mutuals. I would hope that members of the government who have farm mutuals operating in their areas, areas that they represent in rural Ontario, would also take the opportunity to speak perhaps briefly during second reading debate in respect to the concerns of farm mutuals, because we know they are good citizens in our communities and certainly active participants in our municipalities in a very positive sense.

I want to encourage government members to take a

look at what they're saying, take a look at the proposals they are putting forth in terms of substantive amendments to Bill 134. I think they're positive recommendations, positive changes, which will put them on a level playing field in respect to the changes that are going to benefit credit unions and caisses populaires.

In essence, that sums up my contribution. I encourage especially the government members during the course of this debate, during public hearings and when the legislation comes back for third reading, to give very serious consideration to the concerns of farm mutuals.

1650

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you to the member for Leeds-Grenville. Are there any questions or comments to the member? Further debate.

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** It's a privilege to rise today to talk a little bit about Bill 134. In the county of Huron we have a number of credit unions—no caisses populaires that I'm aware of—in Goderich and Wingham, Clinton and Exeter, and in fact, a number of years ago, the Exeter branch amalgamated with the Clinton credit union which I am personally involved with in more ways than one: a few bills.

It was started back in 1952. The basic premise around the credit union system is what we've all heard, but I think it deserves to be said again, the principle where people really do invest in their communities and the money really does stay in their communities and it's an opportunity for growth.

Many of these institutions were actually started by church organizations. I believe that's how Clinton was started, by some people who had more than just a business point of view, but a bit of a social responsibility and something that as New Democrats is—

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** Social gospel.

**Mr Klopp:** Yes, social gospel we can say. It is a business but with a social responsibility, something that, as New Democrats, is pretty easy for many of us to understand, and many people.

The changes are definitely necessary. The last time there were some amendments was back in 1983, I understand, and I believe at that time they probably should have gone further, but at the time things were moved along.

This will allow the credit union system to really compete out there in the financial field. It will provide flexibility and financing arrangements, enhance the ability to attract more depositors, build member confidence and commitment and strengthen, of course, the credit unions' and the caisses populaires' financial contribution to the communities.

It ties in very well with our community economic development strategy. We said very early in our mandate, and many of us over the years, when they said, "Why are you taking the time to run for the NDP?" I said that one of the things was that we need to really talk about and act on community economic development and build on these kinds of structures and create out there in the financial institutions some fair and good competition and

let the community decide how it will do things.

It ties in very well with our FarmPlus program at the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. When we set the committee up, we heard many people say over the years—myself, as a Huron county federation member—with the real credit crunch in the early 1980s, "If I knew that the money would be going directly back into the community for the farmers and some of those businesses that have value added, I would put some of my money that I have into that." There was never really a course for that.

The credit union system was there, but under some of the regulations, for example, they could only really give 15% of their portfolio to small business. It really did inhibit them from being some real good competition out there. This act will change that.

We happen to have it that the credit union system is using the FarmPlus program and is the carrier. We were very happy when it made a motion to carry that program, but we see that these changes will enhance its ability out in the farm community.

As many of you are aware, FarmPlus is the opportunity for people of all walks of life, not just retired farmers, but your cousin in the city or your friends in town, whatever, to put some of their money into GICs which go directly back to the community for farm loans or value added loans. Value added loans, I think, are the way to go. Farmers need to stretch their positions in the marketplace, not just produce but also go on and further process those products that they produce, and this is another vehicle, another area for them to do that because there are some financial dollars there which they can come to.

It's been a fairly good success. We have been pleasantly surprised. In the last seven weeks, way over \$10 million has been invested in these FarmPlus GICs and that says a lot about the community spirit that's out there in Ontario.

I want to say that a lot of people out there have worked very hard to build the credit union system in this country and, in fact, as one person said to me once, "In spite of government regulations, we've been succeeding." I think it says a lot.

We're now making some very positive changes, some more, to bring them up so that they can move forward. Earlier it was mentioned by a colleague across the floor about the farm mutuals and it's something that I know has been talked about. I very much understand the farm mutual system. I've been involved with it in our family tree; my great-grandfather sold wind insurance for one of the companies many, many years ago.

The issue I think is something that we're taking very seriously and I respect the comments. I support many of those motions that are coming forth with farm mutuals as well.

In closing, I take a moment of tribute to all the credit unions that have been out there over the years, especially the ones in Huron county, that have helped the communities, and this bill will further allow them to be partners out in the field and will only do us all well.

**The Acting Speaker:** Are there any questions or



comments to the member for Huron?

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** I'd like to commend Paul for talking here today about rural communities and about the part that credit unions play in our rural communities. I know in my community, we have the St Willibrord credit union and it's been very active in our community for over 25 years. As a matter of fact, I know that the manager is retiring this year after 25 years in the St Willibrord credit union and it's marvellous to see José Cozyn talk about how it was when it was starting and how she got involved in the community and how the community came together to form that credit union.

Today it's also very good to hear my colleague talk about FarmPlus, because I was just talking to José recently about the FarmPlus program and how important it is to rural communities that our farmers can now reinvest their money into the agricultural area and still maintain some of the investment security that they like to have in an RRSP.

I'd like to just add my comments to my colleague's and say that I'm very supportive of this legislation. I know that they are very excited about this going through. They want to see this as quickly as possible. I'm also pleased to hear the member talk about community action and community economic development because I think credit unions play a very strong role in the economic development of our communities and I'm pleased to see them tie into the community action programs that we have out there. I just wanted to put a few remarks on the record to say how much I appreciate credit unions in my own community and would like to see this legislation go through.

**The Acting Speaker:** Any further questions or comments? I'm wondering if the member for Huron would wish to reply.

**Mr Klopp:** No.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I'm pleased to join the debate. I'm hopeful that this bill, and I think it does, will reinforce some of the things that I view as important to getting our economy rolling. I don't think there's any doubt that as you talk to businesses across the province—medium businesses, small businesses, even some of our larger businesses—one of the primary concerns they have is the financing for their businesses.

Our caucus has just been around the province in I think 16 different communities on what we call a jobs task force and we were asking the community for advice on how we get the economy rolling, how we can see jobs created. I think it's fair to say that one of the top issues for the business community, for the job creating community, is the lack of appropriate financing for them.

It's easy to be critical of the banks, but I think even the banks themselves would acknowledge that they have not done a good job on adapting to the changing economy, to smaller businesses. As the banks have gotten larger, in some respects I think more bureaucratic, further removed from the community, I don't think they've adapted quickly enough to how small business can access

the necessary and appropriate capital. I think they're playing catch-up on it. I applaud them and for my part I will do whatever I can to encourage them to put a lot more effort into it. Virtually all the banks are now putting, in different ways, a lot of effort into it. The Ontario lead investment fund, I think they call it, is something most of the banks are participating in. But it's going to be a while before they've really got in place the mechanisms to respond appropriately to small emerging businesses.

1700

I look forward to the committee, where the public can get involved and give us their comments on it, but from my reading of the bill and from my colleague's explanation of the bill, I think this is a useful and important step forward in helping to provide more access to capital for our small and medium-sized businesses, emerging businesses, for a variety of reasons.

One is that I do think there is an enormous advantage in community-based funding. People loan money to people. There's no doubt that the credit unions are very much community-based, and I dare say that most of the money they loan would be to people they know or that members of the credit union know. There's an enormous advantage to that, because not only is it all the numbers, but there are personalities and people involved in it. One of the challenges the banks face is that they are sometimes too far removed from the community. I hope they're moving to fix that, but in the meantime, strengthening our credit unions and giving them more access to funding small business is good.

Also, we all need the assurances—the public needs the assurances, the credit unions need the assurances, the people who are depositing money in the credit unions and the people who are borrowing money—that the credit unions are well established and have in place mechanisms that ensure the security of the depositors. This bill is helpful in that respect.

Another part of the bill I'm very supportive of is the whole area of the amendments to the Toronto Stock Exchange Act. I happen to think Ontario, more particularly sometimes the greater Metropolitan Toronto area, has, to use the cliché, a world-class financial community. We have financial institutions, we have insurance companies, we have the banks, and we have a stock exchange that works very well. But it's important that wherever we can, we move to strengthen the confidence people have in investing in public offerings.

We've been fortunate in Ontario that to a very large extent people have felt comfortable, when the stock exchange lists a security or a stock, that the information they're getting is accurate and that they can rely on it. But it only takes a few examples where people feel that the investments they've made have been made on the basis not of full disclosure and not the information that they should have had when they were making that investment.

I view as another important element in our economic wellbeing that not only do our small, emerging businesses have access to capital and to funding, but that as our businesses look to public offerings, where they raise

perhaps more significant amounts of money, where they raise equity financing as opposed to debt financing, we have a securities operation that people feel absolutely, totally confident in. I'm pleased to see we are making some amendments to the stock exchange act that I hope will further strengthen that.

As I said, we face an enormous challenge in the province. Many of our future jobs are coming from industries that are more idea-based and more based on information and technology. They aren't those hard assets that we used to see. I've had an opportunity to talk with some of the people in the agricultural community who are very much involved in technology and biotechnology and the use of technology. Those are ideas that, for traditional lenders, sometimes are difficult to put a value on, so many of these businesses that want to grow have difficulty in accessing capital, difficulty in accessing funds, because the lenders don't see those hard assets.

Once again, as I read the bill and interpret its direction, this should be helpful in strengthening our credit unions and providing them with an opportunity to compete on a fairer basis with the other financial institutions, helpful in raising additional sources of funding. As I look at the bill, I start from the point of view of saying that what is important to our party, what is important, we think, to the province, is, how will we help get the economy going? There is no question that this access to funding, access to capital, is one of the keys. If I read the bill properly, I think this is a step forward.

So I'm supportive of it at this stage. I'm looking forward to the debate at committee, where other members of the public who are more intimately involved in aspects of this bill can come before us and make their suggestions on where we may improve the bill. In the meantime, as we proceed to what we call second reading agreement in principle here, I will be supportive of this bill and look forward to it being helpful to our economy.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I thank the honourable member for Scarborough-Agincourt for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr Marchese:** I'm pleased that the member for Scarborough-Agincourt is supporting this bill. I want to respond to some of the comments he made, to somewhat strongly disagree with statements he made about the banks.

In the last year that I've been working on the issue of small business, we have discovered that the six chartered banks have not been very charitable with small business, so I don't have a charitable view of the banks over the last year that I have been working with small business. In fact, they have not been moving very fast to address the concerns at all. For three long years, from 1989 to 1993, the small business loans from the banks had decreased and the bigger companies were getting the larger share of banks' loans.

When you consider that 85% of all jobs are produced by small business, something is wrong with that. Quite clearly, the banks are not helping our economy, because they're not helping small business or producing those jobs. So the banks are moving extremely slowly and only

through the pressures that we've been applying to them.

Two banks have created two different kinds of positions in the last month or so, one an ombudsman position and the other a dispute mechanism panel to deal with disagreements where there are disagreements. I think that's useful. They should be acknowledged and praised for that.

But I want to say to Mr Phillips that they are indeed playing catch-up, but there is a lot more that banks need to do to be able to help our economy with full employment. This particular bill on co-ops puts them at the same level with banks, because with the \$10 billion they put into the economy, they will be able to help small business in a way that will be more effective and produce the kinds of jobs we're looking for.

**The Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? Seeing none, the honourable member for Scarborough-Agincourt has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Phillips:** I'm not sure the member listened carefully to me, because I think I said exactly what he said, that in my opinion the small business community has not been well served by the banking community.

**Mr Marchese:** You were very charitable.

**Mr Phillips:** While no doubt they are without question playing catch-up now, I am supportive of this bill. The member was essentially repeating what I said.

I happen to think the banks have a long way to go. I know the government's very actively involved with them in the Ontario lead investment fund, and that's probably a pretty good idea. But this bill I think will be useful in helping the small business community in the province have better access to capital, have better access to funding for their startup businesses and better access to grow their businesses. The member may not have been listening carefully when I said I don't think the small business community has been well served by the banking community in the past few years and they need a lot more effort. Some of it's coming. Much more has to happen.

1710

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate?

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I'm delighted to rise to speak a little longer than the opportunity I had yesterday doing a two-minute rebuttal on Bill 134. I will speak primarily to the aspect of the credit union. I realize that this bill contains provisions governing other aspects. For example, there are apparently tougher standards proposed for life insurance agents, and my suspicion is that that's a good thing.

One thing I didn't realize is that there are apparently 19,000 life insurance agents in the province of Ontario, and this bill will introduce a two-tier licensing and examination process for those 19,000 life insurance agents and it will create a more stringent test to qualify for the level 1 licence. Then it goes on to address the level 2 licence as well.

Those are probably good provisions, but I really don't intend to get into that, nor do I intend to get into the issue of the powers of the Ontario Securities Commission. I understand that Bill 134 will enhance the powers that



the OSC has to investigate and sanction breaches of security rules. Again, that's probably a good provision. In general, I must say that I think this bill does have a number of very positive aspects.

What I'll be talking about primarily over the next few minutes will be in relation to the credit unions: the credit unions that involve an amazing 1.8 million people in the province of Ontario. About 18% of our population, 1.8 million people in this province, have a relationship with a credit union.

I was pleased to see that there's some consensus with regard to Bill 134 through the credit unions, in particular the credit union central, which has some 460 members, 460 credit unions across the province of Ontario that are involved with the credit union central. As I understand it, those 460 members would come from all walks of the credit union life, the large credit unions, medium, right down to the very small credit unions, and there is some consensus. Although there is a little bit of a difference of opinion, the basic consensus is that Bill 134 is a positive step.

I hope, as has been expressed by some of the previous speakers, that Bill 134 will go to committee so we will have the opportunity to talk about a few of the areas where there are concerns. It is those concerns I would like to speak about for a little bit today. Most of those concerns, I might add, come from the small credit unions. The small credit unions apparently are basically in support of this bill, but they do have some concerns.

As I mentioned the other day, I've had some involvement with the East York credit union—I must say, a very passive involvement. I was of course the mayor in East York even a year ago today, and I was delighted that in East York, through the municipal employees, about 550 municipal employees that we'd have in East York, there is a credit union that was formed actually in 1941. It was formed by the employees of the borough of East York and it was formed for the purpose of "People helping people." That's what the credit union movement is all about.

Over the years, the credit union has managed to maintain a very healthy financial status for its members.

**Mr Norm Jamison (Norfolk):** Like the banks?

**Mr David Johnson:** Is the member saying something about the banks?

**Mr Jamison:** No. Is that a quote from the banks?

**Mr David Johnson:** No, that quote is from the credit union, the East York credit union, "People helping people."

But the member talks about banks, and the banks have been criticized here today. I'm not going to be one to defend the banks, but I must say that it's very easy to sit here in this House and take potshots at the banks when we don't have to answer to the investors, to the depositors of the banks. The people that have their money with the banks, the people that have their money invested in the banks, are expecting that the banks will take a very cautious attitude towards the investments. They expect those investments to be stable, they expect those investments to be realized, that they will be paid back, and they

don't expect the investments to be defaulted.

So the banks do have an obligation above and beyond what anybody in this House does. Our obligation, I suppose, is to criticize the banks for not making enough money available to small businesses. I don't think there's anybody who would deny that they've been overly conservative in terms of their approach to small business. Even the banks today are recognizing the fact that for the last two or three or four years they have perhaps been too cautious in that regard. However, for those people who have their money in the banks, they're very delighted to get the best possible return that they can get. So there's another sector of society out there; let's not forget about that.

At any rate, when we're talking about the small credit unions, I do think of the East York credit union. The East York credit union, by the way, has assets that last year amounted to just over \$3 million. Loans reflected about 81% of the assets. I haven't worked that out, but I guess that's about \$2.5 million in loans and over \$3 million in assets. This is a credit union that is what I would call a community-based credit union, very close to its people, very aware of the people that it's serving. This is the kind of credit union that has a bond, if I can express it that way, with the people that it's serving. Indeed, the people that it's serving form the directorship, the executive members of the association, and essentially run the credit union, and they do it in an excellent fashion. It's the kind of credit union that we would certainly want to preserve, and it's the kind of credit union that we would not want any harm to come to.

The expenses: On assets of \$3 million, the expenses are about \$100,000 a year, which is a very small amount. So it's very frugally run. As indicated before, they can run it in that fashion because they do have the strong support of the members.

I'm pleased to say that this year they're indicating that the dividend on the shares will be 6%, which is an increase from the previous year, 1993, and that in turn was an increase over 1992. So this is a successful credit union. It's a small credit union but a successful one. Its deposits are growing and its loans are growing. It's the kind of credit union that I'm sure we would all wish to support.

The impression that I'm getting, however, is that what's taking place in society is that some of the smaller credit unions are not able to continue existing. The larger credit unions are surviving. The larger credit unions perhaps are amalgamating some of the smaller ones. If there's jeopardy associated in the credit union field, it may be with the smaller credit unions.

That's why I think it's important to look at some of the concerns that they have raised. I'm sure these concerns can be addressed during the committee hearings. There seems to be a lot of good will associated with this bill, so I'm sure they can be addressed.

1720

One concern they've expressed is that reserves will be required to be increased, that they will have to increase reserves. This is based on an assessment of risk. This is

good and this is bad. If the risk is higher, then perhaps the reserve should be increased. There's greater protection for the depositor. It's very difficult to oppose that sort of situation.

But on the other hand, the smaller credit unions have that bond with their members. They understand the risk associated with their members and their defaults are very low. In the case of East York—I'm not sure if I can find it here now; here it is, as a matter of fact—they have a provision for doubtful loans of \$212. I think that's a remarkable achievement. It shows that they are able to assess their own people, work with their own people, and in that climate of cooperation the defaults are extremely low. The problem is that if the reserve is raised too high for the risk, then this may have an impact on the smaller credit unions. It's something we should look at during the committee process.

A second point that was raised, and again there's good news and there's bad news, is that there is an additional range of products and services that the credit unions are being allowed to pursue, which is good because many of the credit unions have indicated that they've had a problem being competitive with some of the other lending institutions, the banks and the trust companies, I presume, and that to retain their membership they need various other services. That's good.

The difficulty is that with some of the smaller credit unions they may not have the resources to pursue these other services and consequently they may get forced out because they may become uncompetitive. I don't know what we do about that. That's a difficult situation. I understand that's not an easy one to solve.

**Mr Elston:** What, no answers from the Tories?

**Mr David Johnson:** Give us a moment and we'll have the answer.

That's something I think we should recognize. These additional services include, for example, selling public transit tokens and lottery tickets. I imagine just about any credit union could sell those kinds of things. Apparently, there's some discussion about selling—

**Mr Elston:** There isn't too much transit in Wingham.

**Mr David Johnson:** Not too much transit in Wingham? All right. I'll trust my good colleague from the Liberal ranks, the member for Bruce. He can certainly comment on Wingham with a great deal more authority than I can—

**Mr Elston:** It's in Huron.

**Mr David Johnson:** —but I'm sure there may be lottery tickets that may be sold in Bruce, as well.

If the services proceeded into something a little more complex, such as mutual funds, then I think we would all agree that there would be many smaller credit unions that would find it difficult to keep that sort of expertise on their staff. In that sense, they would be uncompetitive.

I also note that this bill will permit the credit unions to be involved with the community loan funds which have just been set up through Bill 40. The loan funds were designed by this government essentially to make loans to small businesses which could not receive a loan from a bank or were turned down by a bank or another financial

institution, presumably because they were a poorer risk. Then the community loan fund would be able to make a loan. The community loan fund would get its funding from within the community. Previously, the credit unions have been restricted and could not invest but now, under this bill, credit unions will be able to put money into that sort of venture.

I suppose, in a sense, that's a little bit positive, but I will say again, as I said during the debate for Bill 40 and the community loan funds, if you ask the business people of the province of Ontario, what they really need, more than more avenues to loan money, is to have less cost. That's what the businesses right across this province are saying: "If you really want to help us as a government, then reduce the cost, reduce the taxes, reduce the payments that we have to make, such as the workers' compensation. Look at all of those costs. Work with municipalities on the property tax." Those are the real problems that are facing business today, the payroll costs, the taxes etc.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** How much of a reduction, Dave, 1%, 10%, 50%?

**Mr David Johnson:** To my colleague, any reduction will be helpful, even freeze the budget.

**Mr Perruzza:** Put a proposal on the table on how to achieve it.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr David Johnson:** I heard the Minister of Finance say this afternoon that we won't have a tax increase this year in Ontario, and I hope I can take him at his word.

**Mr Elston:** What does he do? He puts a tax on the student, right?

**Mr David Johnson:** He puts a tax on the students and increases by 20% the fees to the students. There's a tax increase right off the bat.

**Mr Elston:** Didn't take long for him to break that one.

**Mr David Johnson:** The member for Bruce is pointing out that the minister has a very narrow definition of what a tax increase is, but certainly that's how we get business going, not through community loan funds but through reducing the burden on our businesses.

Finally, one other point I've heard that may or may not be a problem, and again it involves the competitiveness of the smaller credit unions, is that they will now be eligible to sell shares to members outside of the credit union members. This is certainly a good thing, I'm sure, for many credit unions. They will be able to attract extra capital and be able to invest in larger projects than they would've previously.

I'm not sure of the mechanism for doing this. Perhaps this will be made more apparent during the committee hearings. If it involves full disclosure, for example, to the outside members, which we have some suspicion that it might, then that could be a very costly exercise, not so much for the large credit unions but for the smaller credit unions, thereby in a sense really prohibiting them from participating in this exercise, and consequently putting them at a competitive disadvantage. This perhaps will become clear during the committee hearings.



Those are the comments I would have with regard to Bill 134. I'm very pleased to see it go to committee and to continue the debate there.

The member for Downsview asked me how much we should put the taxes down this year, and maybe in final response to the member's question, I would say that the municipalities are still waiting today. They were promised two years ago that they would have a 1% increase in their transfer payments, followed by a 2% increase, followed by another 2% increase this year. What happened? They received, first of all, an 11% reduction, then a 20% reduction on their transfer payments for their unconditional grants.

I guess the member for Downsview is not listening to this. The conditional grants form 84% of the transfers from the province to the municipalities, so the announcement today on the grants transfer really reflects a very small proportion of the money that goes from the province to the municipalities.

Before we say hallelujah that the province isn't going to cut to the municipalities any more and is going to live up to its word in that regard—and that's what we're really talking about, keeping its promise—we should wait and see if it keeps its promise on the other aspect, on the conditional grants.

Then if we can do that, perhaps municipalities can put their property taxes down and I hope that this province will be able to do the same thing. If we can do that, we will get people back to work, we will have successful businesses in the province of Ontario, and that will be an even greater boost to our economy than Bill 134.

1730

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Don Mills for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr Marchese:** Just some comments to respond to the member's—

**Mr Elston:** What is going on here?

**Mr Marchese:** Just two minutes. Reference has been made again to the banks, and I want to make some comments about that.

The member says yes, it's easy to take potshots at the banks, and perhaps it's true. You commented about the fact that we have to worry about the investors and their investment into the banks. I just want to point out to the member and to others that 90% of what the banks control comes from us—we are the investors—and 10% of private bucks goes into the banks. So when we talk about private investment, I have a big concern about whose money they're spending and how.

Yes, they're looking for stable investment, yes, they're looking for their money to be paid back, and yes, they're looking for the best return. But I argue that the best return is for banks to invest their money into small business in this country, and I argue that they have an important responsibility as banks to make sure this country and the people of Ontario are back to work. That's my response to the aspect of banks, although I support many other concerns that the member has raised. I'm happy to see he's supporting this act as well.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** The member for Fort York comments about the banking industry. I am probably the last guy in the world who's going to defend the banks. Frankly, I find it very difficult.

The problem the member for Fort York has is an ideological problem with the banking industry. The banking industry doesn't see it the same way he sees it.

**Mr Marchese:** Is that right?

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm not saying it's right or wrong. I'm just saying that the dilemma that's facing this country today is that the banking industry doesn't see its role as job creation. They don't. They don't see that their role is anything else but to protect the investors of that bank. Now, 90% of the people in fact hold ownership of those banks. Those people choose to do business with that bank and that bank is doing its best to maintain and control the moneys safeguarded by them in the best possible fashion.

The difficulty is, maybe we should expand a broader review of the banking industry, period. Maybe there should be more schedule A banks. Maybe there should be a number of banks out there that can do more things, much like this piece of legislation. The point that needs to be made is that it's a fine line. The debate you can get into is the American model, the debacle of the S&Ls and how they were handled and how they dealt with their moneys and the moneys that were entrusted to them with respect to lending and loan criteria and investment in small business and so on and so forth.

**Mr Marchese:** It's been working.

**Mr Stockwell:** There are a lot of states in the United States that are going to tell you the S&Ls didn't work, and there are a lot of people in the federal government who are going to tell you, after bailing them out, that the S&Ls didn't work. Having said that, there's got to be a balance somewhere. I'm not sure this is the debate.

I don't disagree with you. I think the banking industry needs to get a smack in a lot of respects and straighten up. But the bottom line is that they don't see their role as job creators, they don't see their role as investing their money on behalf of government. They see it solely as protecting their investors. I'm not sure that's wrong, but maybe the industry should be widened, there should be more players involved, and maybe we'd have a better opportunity of recovering from this recession.

**Mr Perruzza:** I'm not going to stand up in defence of banks. I'm going to leave that to the Conservatives. They can defend their banking friends and defend the policies of the banking industry over the last little while, especially their policies throughout the recession, their stranglehold, quite frankly, and the manner in which they've been suffocating small businesses and killing jobs.

I want to speak to some of the comments that were made by the honourable member from East York when he said that what businesses are telling him they need is that we need to cut taxes and cut red tape, and he proceeded to lecture us about taxes and red tape and all the roadblocks that have been placed in the way of small business. Quite frankly, I'm so tired of sitting here and taking lectures from my Conservative friends here in this

House about our record and about their record with respect to small business and the job losses and all the red tape and the taxes and the regulations that have been heaped on business that are making their life miserable.

They come here and they criticize and they lecture, but do they ever put out a plan? Do they ever put any numbers on the table?

**Mr Stockwell:** Our plan is: Resign.

**Mr Perruzza:** I say to him, suggest the cut, suggest by how much, suggest where we can get the money to make that cut, because I'd certainly be interested in looking at that. But when you look at the Conservative record of years gone by, you will see that they didn't cut anything. They increased, increased, increased, increased, and wreaked havoc on our small business sector.

**The Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? Seeing none, the honourable member for Don Mills has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr David Johnson:** I'm pleased that the member for Downsview has registered such concern. I guess our message is finally starting to get home. But his memory I think is a wee bit faded. My recollection is that when the Conservatives left office, the debt in the province of Ontario, for example, was about \$30 billion—I look to my colleague from Etobicoke West and I thank him for his comments—and just 10 years later, we have a debt of almost \$80 billion, about \$78 billion as we sit here today, in the province. When you talk about spending and the fact that the Conservatives when they were in power didn't do cuts or spent unwisely or whatever, it just doesn't ring true.

I thank the member for Etobicoke West for his comments.

I would like to say before my time runs out, though, that I think this bill offers many positive aspects for the credit unions. I think that needs to be reiterated. I'm basically in support.

However, when we shift back to the banks, and I don't think this conversation should necessarily go there, it's not just that the banks don't look at job creation as being their primary goal. The question is that the investors don't look at it that way, and the investors are all of us. When we put our money in, if we don't like what the banks are doing, we can put it somewhere else. There all sorts of other institutions today: green lending institutions and job creation institutions. If people put their money in the bank, they expect the bank to give them a return for their money. That's why banks do what they do, in a sense.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate on this bill?

**M. Jean Poirier (Prescott et Russell):** J'aimerais prendre quelques minutes pour commenter et dire quelques mots, bien sûr, sur le projet de loi 134 intitulé la Loi révisant la Loi sur les caisses populaires et les credit unions et modifiant d'autres lois relatives aux services financiers.

Tout ce que je peux dire c'est que, finalement, un projet de loi nous est présenté qui va moderniser la loi actuelle, qui est quand même une entrave au développement des communautés franco-ontariennes et des caisses

populaires et des «credit unions», mais qui est aussi une entrave au développement de la communauté comme telle, la communauté franco-ontarienne.

Si je veux m'adresser surtout au sujet des caisses populaires c'est que, bien sûr, à titre de Franco-Ontariens, l'expérience des caisses populaires est surtout celle que nous avons connue, bien que nous soyons très au courant qu'il y a exactement des «credit unions» dans les communautés anglophones autour de nous. C'est évident que le projet de loi touche à deux autres points, mais surtout je voudrais concentrer mes commentaires sur l'implication pour les caisses populaires.

Je me réjouis que ce projet de loi ait été présenté parce que, entre autres, c'est dans la circonscription de Prescott et Russell que vous allez retrouver le plus grand nombre de caisses populaires en Ontario. Je peux vous dire que lorsqu'on considère la situation des caisses populaires en Ontario, vous en avez 60, avec plus de 28 succursales, pour un total de 88. On parle de près de 900 emplois mais on parle aussi d'un actif d'environ deux milliards de dollars. Ces caisses populaires-là sont rassemblées dans deux réseaux distincts, soit celui de la Fédération des caisses populaires et celui aussi de l'Alliance des caisses populaires de l'Ontario. Ce qui est important dans ce projet de loi, c'est que ce réseau de caisses populaires va enfin être reconnu par le projet de loi. Les caisses ne seront plus vues une à une, mais plutôt comme faisant partie intégrale d'un réseau de caisses populaires à l'échelle de l'Ontario.

1740

Vous savez, la communauté franco-ontarienne a toujours été très active dans le mouvement de coopération, dans le mouvement coopératif. Chez nous et ailleurs dans les autres communautés francophones, vous avez plusieurs coopératifs agricoles. Comme je le mentionnais tantôt, vous avez également plusieurs caisses populaires, et en Ontario, nous avons même le Conseil de la coopération de l'Ontario.

Bien sûr, aujourd'hui la communauté franco-ontarienne reconnaît la mondialisation du commerce, le caractère changeant des finances, et elle veut se prendre de plus en plus en main, ce qui est tout à fait normal. Par exemple, nous avons vu récemment, au cours des dernières années, la création de la Chambre économique de l'Ontario, le regroupement des gens d'affaires, et tout récemment nous avons participé à un forum sur le développement économique communautaire, des preuves que la communauté franco-ontarienne croit vraiment au développement économique communautaire, mais aussi au mouvement coopératif.

Aujourd'hui, à cause de la situation financière peut-être également, il y a un grand esprit de coopération qui s'anime dans les communautés francophones. Les caisses populaires et leurs réseaux, soit la Fédération et l'Alliance, sont présents et veulent participer pleinement à l'essor économique des francophones de l'Ontario.

C'est pour ça que je crois que la nouvelle loi va leur permettre, entre autres, de mieux concurrencer les autres institutions financières. Elle va également faciliter le développement économique communautaire et aussi permettre aux caisses populaires de jouer un rôle encore



plus accru, plus visible et plus utile dans la communauté. Mais également, la nouvelle loi va uniformiser les règles du jeu, et ça, je pense que c'est très important.

Vous savez, chez nous dans la communauté francophone, les caisses populaires ont une vision du besoin de la communauté franco-ontarienne. Elles veulent et elles peuvent maintenant, grâce à la nouvelle loi, encore mieux participer à l'essor du développement économique.

Les caisses populaires ont aidé à rédiger l'histoire des communautés franco-ontariennes depuis déjà plus de 80 ans. Ça fait partie intégrale de notre histoire. Les caisses populaires appartiennent à la communauté franco-ontarienne, ce qui en fait, si vous me permettez l'expression, une certaine société distincte. Chez nous, les caisses populaires font partie intégrale de tout ce qui se fait dans le monde des affaires. Plusieurs Franco-Ontariens sont membres, sont actionnaires des caisses populaires. J'en suis un moi-même, et fièrement, à ma Caisse populaire d'Alfred.

Je crois que ce projet de loi-là va aider à valoriser le mouvement des caisses populaires et va aussi leur faciliter la levée de fonds, toujours dans le cadre de favoriser le développement économique communautaire.

Vous savez, la frustration... Ça fait déjà presque 10 ans que je suis député et ça fait presque 10 ans qu'on joue avec le dossier de réformer les lois qui vont mieux encourager, faciliter le travail des caisses populaires, des «credit unions», et dans ce cas-ci aussi des agents d'assurances et de la Commission de valeurs mobilières ; 10 ans, trois gouvernements, mais il n'est pas trop tard. Mieux vaut tard que jamais, n'est-ce pas ?

Donc, c'est pour ça que je tiens à féliciter les caisses populaires et les «credit unions», mais aussi plus particulièrement la Fédération des caisses populaires de l'Ontario pour leur apport à la mise à jour de cette loi régissant justement les caisses populaires. Je sais que les caisses populaires de la Fédération et de l'Alliance ont travaillé très fort pour donner des renseignements, pour dire leurs besoins, pour faire des commentaires sur les propositions que les différents gouvernements ont faites au cours des années. Je leur remercie de leur coopération, à la Fédération avec M. Benoît Martin, le président, et Pierre Lacasse, le directeur général, qui ont toujours su communiquer à nous, les députés, leurs besoins, soit leurs désirs dans cette réforme de la loi actuelle.

Je voudrais aussi remercier les caisses populaires de ma circonscription qui m'ont contacté pour me dire leur appui et m'encourager à appuyer ce projet de loi-là : la Caisse populaire d'Alfred avec Denis Laframboise, la Caisse populaire de Hawkesbury, M. Fernand Gauthier, et la Caisse populaire d'Orléans, M. Michel Papineau. À vous trois, un grand merci de votre communication. Je suis certain que toutes les caisses de la circonscription de l'Ontario francophone se feront un plaisir de voir le passage de cette loi-là que j'espère très prochain.

I think the movement for the caisses populaires and the credit unions, the reforms for insurance and other reforms to be brought forward by this bill are very much needed. It's never too late. I wish it could have been done over 10 years ago—a lot longer, according to some of my colleagues—but at least it's up there, forward, and I think

that globally a lot of us will be supporting this bill.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Prescott and Russell for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**M. Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa-Est) :** Je voudrais féliciter mon collègue de Prescott et Russell, qui vient de décrire le mouvement des caisses populaires et des «credit unions» en Ontario, et je suis tout à fait d'accord qu'avec ce projet de loi, les caisses populaires vont s'épanouir en Ontario.

Comme il a été mentionné, depuis une dizaine d'années la Fédération et l'Alliance des caisses populaires de l'Ontario ont travaillé avec au moins trois gouvernements pour améliorer leur situation et leur permettre de s'épanouir. De plus en plus, surtout durant les sept ou les huit dernières années, les francophones en Ontario veulent prendre en main leur économie. Je crois que le projet de loi devient un outil de développement non seulement pour les caisses populaires et les «credit unions» en Ontario, mais il va permettre l'épanouissement économique.

Je suis certain qu'avec la situation économique d'aujourd'hui, nous avons besoin de tous les outils nécessaires pour le développement non seulement de nos caisses, mais en plus de ça, pour démontrer à nos grandes banques, les six grandes banques, que nous voulons, même si nous faisons partie — on fait partie intégrale de l'économie de l'Ontario mais, par contre, les grandes banques ne servent pas tellement bien la petite entreprise. Aujourd'hui, avec ce projet de loi, je crois que les caisses populaires vont peut-être connaître le même résultat — je le souhaite — que les caisses du Québec, parce qu'aujourd'hui, elles ont accumulé un fonds qui est respecté non seulement dans leur propre province mais qui est très bien reconnu à travers le Canada.

Alors, je dois féliciter le gouvernement d'avoir apporté ce projet de loi. Je crois que ce projet de loi est attendu depuis longtemps et nous allons certainement appuyer le projet de loi.

**The Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments?

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** I also compliment the member from Prescott-Russell in his remarks. I think it really is overdue. It's been 10 years, and I'm very proud that I belong to a government that's able to bring this bill forward to help especially small business and farmers.

I don't want to be too tough on the poor banks, but one of the things I think we've witnessed in this province and in this country is how a lot of the banks have actually turned their backs on small business and farmers. There are a lot of people, and I know the member was relating to that, who have faithfully paid off their loans on a timely basis, their operating loans and things like this, and the banks just all of a sudden said, "We're not taking any more chances with you little people." I think it's very, very sad.

I'd also like to compliment Mr Owens for all the hard work that he has done, and I'm sure the people in the caisses populaires and the credit unions across this province are waiting very anxiously. I understand that all three parties are supporting this bill and I think that's really great. It'll certainly help, especially in the rural

economic development in this province.

**The Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? The honourable member for Bruce.

1750

**Mr Elston:** I was left with the task which I had undertaken to carry out on behalf of the member for St Catharines. He has in his area a very strong credit union movement and he had asked that I put on the record for him—in fact, I really didn't have to, because he has been a very strong proponent of a position of moving steadily forward with their reforms.

I wanted to rise now because the member for Prescott and Russell had indicated that a large number of the members here were supportive. In fact, I think probably the vote which is about to be taken will show that there won't be an objection at all and we can get this bill out to committee.

Just a note to say that the member for St Catharines, as I indicated earlier, has been a very, very strong proponent of reform for the credit unions. He has seen what can be done in the locales in the Niagara Peninsula with the very strong movement of the Niagara Credit Union and the very strong economic role it has played in the peninsula in making sure that there has been a growing local involvement in financing the initiatives down in that area. As Mr Bradley, the member for St Catharines, has said, this will help for that role to continue in strength and manner.

I think it's fair to say that the sense in the credit union and caisse populaire movement probably is that if there are broader powers, perhaps that will help them to expand somewhat more, not just those that exist, but perhaps to move into areas that they know they do not occupy at the moment. In fact, there will be some vigour perhaps pumped into the movement that will allow them to serve some of those areas that are now underserved. For instance, the member for Cochrane South had mentioned the example of Ear Falls and the concerns there. Perhaps this really will give them a bit of a head start in moving in to help those underserved areas.

**The Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? Seeing none, the honourable member for Prescott and Russell has up to two minutes for his reply.

**M. Poirier :** Donc, c'est évident, ce que mes collègues ont dit. Ça confirme que même si on ne veut pas lancer de pierres aux banques, il y a un créneau, il y a une niche spéciale, surtout dans les petites communautés, qu'elles soient francophones ou anglophones, surtout dans les communautés agricoles et rurales, où les «credit unions», et les caisses populaires maintenant, grâce à la nouvelle loi, seront en mesure de venir combler des besoins qui présentement, ou peut-être dans un avenir rapproché, ne seront pas du tout ou moins comblés par le système des banques actuel.

Je pense que, comme mon collègue de Bruce justement nous l'a dit, la plupart, sinon la totalité, des députés vont appuyer ce projet de loi-là. Ça, je veux bien que les gens notent, qu'à l'occasion quand il y a un projet de loi qui est présenté de ce genre, il y a quasiment l'unanimité parmi les 130 députés, peu importe qui le présente et qui

l'appuie. Si les journalistes à Queen's Park prenaient plus le temps de souligner le travail de coopération que font les 130 députés quand il y a un projet de loi de ce genre qui est présenté, peut-être que les gens verraient qu'il n'y a pas seulement de la confrontation, mais également de la coopération à Queen's Park.

Ce que je souhaite, c'est qu'une fois qu'on aura la deuxième lecture, ce projet de loi-là puisse passer rapidement en troisième lecture sans végéter, pourrir et attirer des fils d'araignée, de travail de moine, en comité, parce qu'on est tous d'accord. Ça fait déjà trop longtemps que nous attendons ce projet de loi-là. De grâce, que les trois partis ne fassent pas en sorte que ce projet de loi-là pourrisse en travail de comité et qu'on attende l'arrivée d'un prochain gouvernement parce que ce projet-là se remord aux feuilles.

Donc, j'espère que ça ne se produira pas et j'apprécie immensément l'appui de tous les 130 députés pour voir à la réalisation du projet de loi 134.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate on this bill? If not, the parliamentary assistant, the honourable member for Scarborough Centre, may conclude the debate on second reading.

**Mr Owens:** I'll keep my remarks quite short. As a matter of fact, the member for Prescott and Russell, whose remarks I quite appreciate, could serve as my wrapup in terms of the necessity to get this piece of legislation out to committee.

I'd like to thank the representatives of the three parties who have participated in the debate over the last two days. I think there is a general recognition that this is a non-partisan issue and that the reformation of the credit union act, the life agent reform and the Securities Act is much needed and will aid in the development of the economic position of the province.

A number of members, again over the last two days in session, on all sides of the House, have raised the issue with respect to farm mutuals. I want to tell those members and I want to assure the representatives in the farm mutual community that we are taking their concerns quite seriously and are working quite hard to develop amendments that we hope to introduce, either through this process or another process to follow shortly.

Again, while members on this side of the House have certainly thanked me for the work that has gone into this bill, I think the credit clearly goes to the credit union and caisse populaire movement. Perhaps I'm being repetitious, but this is a group that has worked extremely hard to resolve some of the issues that have plagued the credit union and caisse populaire movement for a very long time, and it's with that sense of cooperation, that sense of movement, that we find ourselves here today.

I wish I could name each and every credit union and caisse populaire person I had the pleasure of meeting over the last period of time. These are all people, again, as I indicated, with respect to the caisses populaires and the credit unions, who are from our communities. They're our friends, they're our family, and in terms of the kinds of community economic development that this province is looking to, it will be provided by the credit union and



the caisse populaire movement. This is the kind of community economic development that will create the kinds of jobs that this province needs.

The member for Oriole mentioned that this is not particularly a job creation bill. I want to gently disagree with the member for Oriole, that in fact this is a job creation bill. By allowing credit unions and caisses populaires to free up the capital that's sitting there pent up waiting to get out into the community, that will create jobs.

The small business community, we all know, on all three sides of the House, creates 75% of the new jobs, and when that amount of money is unleashed into the community, we're going to be able to see some sound community economic development and a clear ability to create sustainable and recession-proof jobs.

With that, I want to again thank all members of this House for their cooperation and their foresight in helping to move this bill through. With that, I'll end my remarks.

**The Speaker:** Mr Owens has moved second reading of Bill 134, An Act to revise the Credit Unions and

Caisses Populaires Act and to amend certain other Acts relating to financial services.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The motion is carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** We refer it to the economics and finance standing committee.

**The Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered. Orders of the day.

**Mr Owens:** Adjourn.

**The Speaker:** It being nearly 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 10 of the clock tomorrow morning—I'm sorry, till 1:30. I know everyone is eager to be here tomorrow morning. It will be 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 1759.











# CONTENTS

Wednesday 23 March 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Daffodil Festival</b>                               |      |
| Mr Jim Wilson  | 5113 |
| <b>Jobs Ontario</b>                                    |      |
| Mrs Mathysen   | 5113 |
| <b>New Liskeard College of Agricultural Technology</b> |      |
| Mr Ramsay  | 5113 |
| <b>Food banks</b>                                      |      |
| Mr Jackson   | 5114 |
| <b>Prince Edward Region Conservation Authority</b>     |      |
| Mr Paul R. Johnson                                     | 5114 |
| <b>Question period</b>                                 |      |
| Mr Phillips  | 5114 |
| <b>Employment equity</b>                               |      |
| Mrs Witmer   | 5115 |
| <b>Mary Westley</b>                                    |      |
| Mr Fletcher  | 5115 |

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

|                          |      |
|--------------------------|------|
| <b>Transfer payments</b> |      |
| Mr Laughren              | 5115 |
| Mrs McLeod               | 5117 |
| Mr Harris                | 5118 |
| <b>Tuition fees</b>      |      |
| Mr Cooke                 | 5116 |
| Mrs Cunningham           | 5118 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|                                |            |
|--------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Tuition fees</b>            |            |
| Mrs McLeod                     | 5118       |
| Mr Cooke                       | 5119       |
| <b>Ontario Hydro</b>           |            |
| Mr Conway                      | 5119       |
| Mr Wildman                     | 5120       |
| <b>Social contract</b>         |            |
| Mr Harris                      | 5120       |
| Mr Laughren                    | 5120, 5126 |
| Mr Bradley                     | 5126       |
| <b>Young offenders</b>         |            |
| Mr Harris                      | 5121       |
| Mr Rae                         | 5121       |
| <b>Pension funds</b>           |            |
| Mr Phillips                    | 5122       |
| Mr Laughren                    | 5123       |
| <b>Transportation of waste</b> |            |
| Mr Tilson                      | 5123       |
| Mr Wildman                     | 5123       |

## Ontario drug benefit program

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Mr Mills                                      | 5124 |
| Mrs Grier                                     | 5124 |
| <b>Native health services</b>                 |      |
| Mr Miclash                                    | 5124 |
| Mrs Grier                                     | 5124 |
| <b>Ministry of Natural Resources policies</b> |      |
| Mr Jordan                                     | 5125 |
| Mr Hampton                                    | 5125 |
| Mr Wildman                                    | 5125 |
| <b>St Marys Paper</b>                         |      |
| Mr Martin                                     | 5126 |
| Ms Lankin                                     | 5126 |

## PETITIONS

|                                  |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Firearms safety</b>           |            |
| Mr O'Neil                        | 5127       |
| <b>Infertility</b>               |            |
| Mr Carr                          | 5127       |
| <b>Education financing</b>       |            |
| Mr Frankford                     | 5127       |
| <b>School facilities</b>         |            |
| Mr Offer                         | 5127       |
| <b>Haemodialysis</b>             |            |
| Mr Jim Wilson                    | 5127, 5128 |
| <b>Human rights</b>              |            |
| Mr Winninger                     | 5128       |
| <b>Ferry service fees</b>        |            |
| Mrs Fawcett                      | 5128       |
| <b>Forest industry</b>           |            |
| Mr Eves                          | 5128       |
| <b>Health services</b>           |            |
| Mr Hayes                         | 5128       |
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>        |            |
| Mr Conway                        | 5128       |
| Mr Gary Wilson                   | 5129       |
| Mr Cleary                        | 5129       |
| Mr Callahan                      | 5129       |
| <b>Ontario Film Review Board</b> |            |
| Mrs Marland                      | 5129       |
| <b>Long-term care</b>            |            |
| Mr Cooper                        | 5129       |

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Standing committee on government agencies, Mrs Marland</b> |      |
| Mrs Marland   | 5130 |
| Deemed adopted  | 5130 |

## FIRST READINGS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>City of Burlington Act, 1994, Bill Pr83, Mrs Sullivan</b>                                 |      |
| Mrs Sullivan   | 5130 |
| Agreed to  | 5130 |
| <b>North Toronto Christian School (Interdenominational) Act, 1994, Bill Pr93, Mr Harnick</b> |      |
| Mr Harnick   | 5130 |
| <b>Eden Community House of Toronto Act, 1994, Ms Akande</b>                                  |      |
| Ms Akande  | 5130 |
| Agreed to  | 5130 |
| <b>Social Assistance Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 144, Mr Carr</b>                  |      |
| Mr Carr  | 5130 |
| Agreed to  | 5130 |
| <b>Tuberate Heat Transfer Act, 1994, Bill Pr86, Mr Huget</b>                                 |      |
| Mr Huget   | 5130 |
| Agreed to  | 5130 |

## SECOND READINGS

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Financial Services Statute Law Reform Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 134, Mr Laughren</b> |                  |
| Mr Bisson   | 5130, 5136, 5139 |
| Mr O'Connor   | 5135             |
| Mr Winninger  | 5135             |
| Mrs MacKinnon   | 5136             |
| Mrs Caplan  | 5136, 5139       |
| Mr Runciman   | 5139             |
| Mr Klopp  | 5141             |
| Mrs Haslam  | 5142             |
| Mr Phillips   | 5142, 5143       |
| Mr Marchese   | 5143, 5146       |
| Mr David Johnson  | 5143, 5147       |
| Mr Stockwell  | 5146             |
| Mr Perruzza   | 5146             |
| Mr Poirier  | 5147, 5149       |
| Mr Grandmaître  | 5148             |
| Mr Hayes  | 5148             |
| Mr Elston   | 5149             |
| Mr Owens  | 5149             |
| Agreed to   | 5150             |

## OTHER BUSINESS

|                       |      |
|-----------------------|------|
| <b>Status of bill</b> |      |
| Mr Elston             | 5130 |

# TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 23 mars 1994

## DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

|                                   |      |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| <b>Semaine de la francophonie</b> |      |
| M. Grandmaître                    | 5113 |

## PREMIÈRE LECTURE

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant des lois en ce qui concerne l'aide sociale, projet de loi 144, M. Carr</b> |      |
| Adoptée   | 5130 |

## DEUXIÈME LECTURE

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Loi de 1993 portant réforme de diverses lois relatives aux services financiers, projet de loi 134, M. Laughren</b> |            |
| M. Bisson   | 5130       |
| M. Poirier  | 5147, 5149 |
| M. Grandmaître  | 5148       |
| Adoptée   | 5150       |



No. 102

N° 102

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

Thursday 24 March 1994

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

Jeudi 24 mars 1994



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

*50th anniversary*

**1944–1994**

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 24 March 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 24 mars 1994

The House met at 1334.

Prayers.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

BRIAN YAM

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I want to take this opportunity to introduce to you and the other members of the assembly a young gentleman named Brian Yam, who is in the members' gallery. He is an MPP for a day. He is a grade 11 student at Jarvis Collegiate in my riding and is part of a program of a number of other students. I do want to thank also his teacher, Elizabeth Finlay, who has chosen him to be the MPP for a day.

I think he is a fine representative of his school. Some of what he's involved in: He's a senator in his student council, a member of the cross-country team, a member of the darkroom staff for the school yearbook, a multi-cultural editor of the school newspaper, a junior vice-president of the business club, assistant coach for the girls' hockey team and involved in the track and baseball teams. He is spending the day with me as an MPP for a day.

He did, however, ask me to pass on one concern that he has in general about the quality of education. He said if he had an opportunity to ask a question as MPP for a day, he would ask a question about making sure that the quality in our schools is maintained and enhanced. His experience is that year to year it's been getting slightly worse. He, however, is doing very well as a grade A student and as a fine and upstanding representative of both the riding and his school.

## KIMBERMOUNT VILLAGE

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I am pleased to congratulate the Affordable Housing Action Association, AHAA, in Mississauga for its innovative new concept in affordable housing.

In partnership with Daniels Development Group Inc, the AHAA is building Kimbermount Village, 30 apartments that cost between \$78,000 and \$130,000. Persons with incomes as low as \$22,000 will be able to own their own homes in Kimbermount Village, without non-profit housing subsidies or rent supplements. This may sound like a miracle, but it is the result of creative thinking and cooperation among several organizations.

A shared equity arrangement between the purchasers of the AHAA allows people who lack the income or savings for traditional financing to buy a home. The Jet Power Credit Union of Mississauga will provide first mortgages because the AHAA has obtained funds for second mortgages from the Canadian Alternative Investment Cooperative, a social investment fund of Roman Catholic priests and nuns.

I wish the partners in Kimbermount Village every success in this exciting endeavour. When 64,000 Ontarians are on waiting lists for affordable housing and non-profit housing subsidies exceed \$1,000 a month in urban areas, a project that provides affordable home ownership without government assistance is a reason to celebrate. Again, congratulations to all involved.

## NATIONAL NUTRITION MONTH

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** March is nutrition month. The focus of the 1994 National Nutrition Month campaign is children's nutrition and some of the special challenges facing parents and care givers of four- to 12-year-olds. In this, the International Year of the Family, the Canadian Dietetic Association is asking all Canadians to help "nourish our children's future."

Children are our most valuable resource. Childhood is a time of rapid growth and constant change. It is a time of development, physically, emotionally, sexually and socially. It is a time when the very foundations for adulthood are being shaped. Their nutritional health and wellbeing during childhood has a major bearing on whether they reach their full potential.

In my riding, the Perth district public health unit celebrated nutrition month in many ways. One of the most popular events was a fishing competition held in our local mall. The youngsters fished for good nutrition. They hooked cardboard models of food which they matched to sections of a rainbow-coloured Canada Food Guide.

## 1340

In Canada today there are approximately three million children between the ages of four and 12, and 20% of Canadian children under age 18 live in poverty. Getting adequate amounts of nutritional food can be a challenge.

Regardless of economic status, parents and other care givers are eager but often unsure of how to give their children the best and healthiest start on life. In Stratford through the corporate sponsorship of the Lori-Jo grocery store, the health unit provides a shop-smart supermarket tour for consumers. They promote healthy eating by helping shoppers read and better understand product labels, make wise use of their grocery dollars and buy nutritional products.

Eating well, being active and feeling good about themselves are just about the most important messages we can give our children. When we nourish our children's future, we also consolidate our own.

## TRANSPORTATION FOR THE DISABLED

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I am directing this statement to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and asking the minister to amend the Municipal Act in order to ensure that the physically challenged in Mississauga have reasonable transportation.



Currently, Transhelp in Mississauga contracts for specially equipped taxi service to provide assistance for the physically challenged. I have been informed that the use of specially equipped taxis gives Transhelp a flexibility in improving service while at the same time reducing costs.

However, under the present wording of the Municipal Act, the city of Toronto can prohibit within its borders the pickup of the physically challenged by Mississauga cabs. This results in a situation where specially equipped cabs in Mississauga can transport the physically challenged from their homes in Mississauga to a point in Toronto such as their doctors' offices but those same cabs cannot pick them up in Toronto.

Therefore, the person who is physically challenged and has a doctor's appointment in Toronto must be picked up by a transportation service in Toronto, transported to the Toronto-Mississauga border, dropped off at the border and then picked up, if you can believe it, by Mississauga transportation and taken to their home.

This is wrong. It is inefficient, it is cumbersome and it must be stopped. I believe this has resulted in a major inconvenience for those residents in Mississauga who are physically challenged.

It is necessary for the minister to amend the Ontario Municipal Act to prevent the city of Toronto from unilaterally acting in a way which hinders the physically challenged in Mississauga.

#### SENIORS' DENTAL CARE

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** Many senior citizens in Ontario, like Mr Harold LeGard of Orillia, have high levels of unmet dental needs because they're on fixed incomes and are not covered by private dental plans.

Mr LeGard and many other senior citizens are frustrated because dental plans for the elderly were highly publicized during the last two provincial election campaigns, but the implementation of such a plan has been a low priority with the former Liberal and current NDP governments.

I know Ontario is experiencing tough fiscal restraints, but I believe that if the government managed its existing resources more effectively and efficiently, we could provide the free dental care targeted to all Canadians over the age of 65 who are most in need.

This OHIP-registered plan could concentrate on diagnostic, preventive and emergency care similar to that available under current private plans. Dentists could bill the government for services rendered according to the Ontario Dental Association suggested fee schedule and the ODA could administer the plan as it currently does for the thousands of social assistance recipients who presently receive free dental care.

As I noted earlier, senior citizens like Harold LeGard know that times are tough, but they also know a limited dental care program targeted to seniors most in need could be implemented if the NDP government would only manage its existing resources more efficiently and effectively.

Get your spending priorities in order and put a stop to

the costly abuses of our social assistance system.

#### ALTERNATIVE FUELS

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** On March 15 of this year I had the great pleasure of assisting the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, Frances Lankin, in an announcement of an infrastructure grant for Commercial Alcohols Inc. This grant will allow the construction of a \$160-million ethanol facility in the city of Chatham.

In October 1993 the Minister of Agriculture and Food, and now Rural Affairs, Elmer Buchanan, announced that Ontario will allow a 14.5-cent excise exemption for ethanol fuel. The final hurdle for the project to begin is to guarantee that the federal excise exemption will be extended for 10 years.

It would appear that the federal Liberal caucus is being influenced by a group of oil company lobbyists who are worried about the competition.

This project will create 1,150 person-years of construction jobs, 90 permanent high-skilled jobs at the facility, 400 spinoff jobs in the agricultural community and a market for 20 million bushels of Ontario-grown corn.

The people of Chatham-Kent are trying to encourage the Liberal government to act on this exemption and to help the local economy. My constituents are sending letters supplied by the Chatham Daily News to Ottawa.

I am sure that since I hear daily from my friends across the floor that they are committed to job creation, they will support the people of Chatham-Kent and the agricultural economy of Ontario by signing one of these letters, which we will collect and send along to the federal cabinet.

I would ask that a page distribute these letters to the members opposite to sign them, and have the page return them back to me so I can forward them to Ottawa. May I have a page, please?

#### TRANSFER PAYMENTS

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** A president of the United States in years gone by, Abraham Lincoln, once said that you can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

I can tell you that it's not for lack of trying, that this government is attempting to achieve that fooling. As I picked up the news clips today, I saw that a freeze which was really a 2% cut was accepted as a freeze, because it says here: "NDP Move Hailed as Good News." "Floyd Stands Pat." "Ontario Backs Off Austerity Moves."

Of course, they were using the old Larry Grossman trick with the Conservative budget of 1983—the Speaker will remember that well—where he paints a very dismal picture, where they let out hints that there might be a lot of cuts, where they say that welfare might even be chopped, where they in effect say to the transfer agencies, "Well, we're going to kick you in the face," and then, when they kick them in the shins, they're supposed to say, "Thank you."

I can assure you that university and college students across this province have not been fooled. Here we have

a government which has pleased management—the presidents—and of course the people who are the victims are left behind by an NDP government that claims to be a government of social justice.

#### WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY AGENCY

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** I am extremely concerned about the edict by the board of directors of the Workplace Health and Safety Agency demanding that the Tourism and Hospitality Industry Health and Safety Education Program, the College, University and School Safety Council of Ontario and the Care-Givers of Ontario Safety and Health Association merge under the control of the Workers' Health and Safety Centre.

When these three organizations presented a joint counter-proposal under which they would merge, but not under the control of the Workers' Health and Safety Centre, the WHSA board responded by ignoring this proposal and issuing a threatening letter on January 28 demanding that they merge under the board's plan by March 31 or have their funding withdrawn. The letter went on to say that these agencies, if they challenged this edict, would receive an immediate withdrawal of their funding.

This dictatorial approach is a serious abuse of power and will not achieve the aim of making workplaces safer. It is imperative that the Minister of Labour take immediate action to mediate a compromise solution.

The WHSA's authoritarian approach to this issue and its failure to even attempt to negotiate a solution clearly illustrates that this board is out of control. It leaves no room for compromise and makes a complete mockery of the idea that it is a cooperative labour-management agency. I urge the Minister of Labour to take action to accept the counterproposal.

#### HAMILTON-WENTWORTH PROJECT

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** On March 2, Premier Bob Rae came to Hamilton to announce the Hamilton-Wentworth plan, a comprehensive plan to deal in part with the controversial Red Hill Creek Expressway. However, this plan is much more than a compromise regarding a road through the Red Hill Creek Valley. It is a creative package that ties together the economy, the environment, our culture and heritage and our transportation networks.

The province will contribute \$3.2 billion to help accelerate the development of a comprehensive network of trails to connect the Niagara Escarpment trails all the way down to Lake Ontario.

1350

My constituents will also benefit from the \$1.5-million fund which will assist them with energy, waste reduction and water conservation in their homes.

Another \$10 million will establish investment funds for new technology in green industries and for the cultural sector.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for York Centre, please come to order.

**Mr Abel:** Well, Mr Speaker, obviously he doesn't think very much of the plan.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** The member for York Centre is asked to come to order.

**Mr Abel:** Many residents in Wentworth North have spoken to me about the Hamilton-Wentworth plan and they're pleased with the proposed package.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Stop the clock. I caution the member for York Centre to please come to order.

**Mr Abel:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. For your own information, I'd like you to know that I have spoken to many residents in Hamilton-Wentworth and they're pleased with the proposed package. They're interested in new ways to tie together our economic future with the ecological future. This plan is a comprehensive and balanced strategy that will benefit all residents of Hamilton-Wentworth.

**The Speaker:** It is now time for oral questions.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** My question is to the minister responsible for Ontario Hydro. As we all know, the clock is ticking and the nuclear power facilities begin an orderly shutdown beginning tomorrow.

Over the last few hours, I've been hearing from a number of municipal electrical utilities across the province, and let me tell you what these deliverers of hydro-electricity are telling me: Never before on the eve of a potential strike or lockout at the giant utility have the municipal electrical utilities heard so little from Hydro. They have truly been kept in the dark as to what the contingency plans are going to be from Hydro and from your government. In fact, general managers from these utilities are telling me that they're hearing nothing. When they speak to their area and regional Hydro people, who normally know something in this situation, those Hydro officials are saying they know nothing. They only know and can only refer to what's been in the paper.

My question to the minister responsible for Ontario Hydro: What, sir, are you and Ontario Hydro telling the municipal electrical utilities across the province as to how they must plan for a potential shutdown or slowdown of Ontario Hydro next week?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** The municipal electrical utilities will know that in the past, historically, in a negotiation between the now Power Workers' Union and Ontario Hydro, in most cases it's in the last few days of the collective agreement that bargaining reaches a settlement. That has been historically the case.

We are working diligently to ensure that the municipal electrical utilities will continue to receive the power they receive from the grid from Ontario Hydro, because in all likelihood there will be a negotiated settlement.

**Mr Conway:** We all hope and pray for a negotiated settlement, but the fact of the matter is, as of this moment, we do not have a negotiated settlement. Within



a very few days, Ontario Hydro will begin to shut down its nuclear power plant which now provides over two thirds of the juice to the system.

The general managers of the various municipal electric utilities with whom I have spoken in the last few hours are very, very concerned, because they have never been in a situation like this before. They know nothing about your contingency plan. They are hearing absolutely nothing from their Hydro contacts out in the field, contacts who previously were much better informed and who could tell them about the backup plan, the contingency plan.

Minister, I ask you again, in view of the fact that we are now just a very few days from the potential shutdown of two thirds of the electricity supply to the province of Ontario, what are you and Ontario Hydro telling the deliverers of this power to most of us in the province, namely, the municipal electric utilities, as to how they are going to manage a potential and dramatic loss of electricity provided by the giant utility, Ontario Hydro?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I reiterate that we are confident that the municipal electrical utilities will continue to be able to deliver the electrical power to the customers of this province, because the members of the Power Workers' Union and the management of Ontario Hydro are working diligently, along with the staff of my colleague the Minister of Labour, to achieve a collective bargaining agreement prior to the expiration of the current agreement.

**Mr Conway:** We all of us expect and believe there to be due diligence and goodwill on all sides, but we have watched this process unfold over days and weeks and we still at this hour do not have what we all want, which is the negotiated settlement.

Never before has the Ontario Hydro system been so dependent on its nuclear supply, and that's why this situation is so different than all others. We are this month depending on the nuclear power program to supply 65% to 70% of the electricity to the province.

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** And I wonder why that is.

**Mr Conway:** I hear the caterwauling of the Minister of Health, but the people of the province want to know what the government of Ontario is doing, what steps it is taking to ensure that there will be a continuous supply of this most vital resource, electricity, to the hospitals, to the schools, to the farms, to the homes, to the industries and to all other outlets in Ontario.

Minister, I ask you again at this very late hour, what is your contingency plan? What are you and Ontario Hydro telling, specifically, your very important partners, the municipal electric utilities out there, that they should prepare for and what they might do in the event of a slowdown or a shutdown of Ontario Hydro next week?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The member can assure the representatives of municipal utilities to whom he has been speaking that this government is working very hard to ensure that the two sides are able to achieve an agreement prior to the end of the current agreement.

I met this morning with Paul Gardner, the director of

mediation services in the Ministry of Labour, who reported to me that the parties worked into the small hours of this morning, diligently, on the major issues to try to reach an agreement and to avoid a disruption. He pointed out to me that in the past in these negotiations, seldom has there ever been an agreement reached prior to March 25. He is working along with his colleague John Mather to assist the parties.

It is true that the union and the management are taking very seriously the health and safety of the people of this province and, in compliance with the AECL's requirements, will take whatever measures are required to ensure the safety and the integrity of the system.

#### TRANSPORTATION OF WASTE

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** A second question to the same gentleman in his capacity as minister of garbage, and my question concerns Toronto garbage.

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** Mr Speaker—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is the question to the Minister of Environment?

**Mr Conway:** If I have offended the tender sensibilities of my friend the member for Ottawa Centre I withdraw. I would never, ever want to ruffle the sensibilities of the Minister of Housing.

1400

**The Speaker:** To whom is your question addressed?

**Mr Conway:** My question is to the Minister of Environment and it concerns Toronto garbage. There are reports this very day quoting officials very close to your office, sir, that clearly leave open the possibility that there may be a possibility that the garbage from greater Toronto might find its way to Kirkland Lake, Ontario.

Can the minister confirm that there is still a possibility under his government's policy that the garbage from Metropolitan Toronto may, under certain circumstances, find its way to Kirkland Lake, Ontario?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** I'm glad that the member has given me the opportunity to clarify what in fact was a misquote in the media. In fact, my assistant informed the reporter in question that the matter remains, as it always has been, that a proponent could, if a proponent wished, proceed with an environmental assessment on a proposal related to Kirkland Lake and rail-haul, but the Environmental Assessment Board would have to rule and would have to take into account the government policy and the law as it is in place in the province.

**Mr Conway:** I bet you appreciated the opportunity to make that response. Help me understand your policy. You are in fact then confirming that it is the policy of the Bob Rae government to ensure that Metropolitan Toronto garbage must go to deep holes costing tens of millions of dollars dug into some of the most fertile agricultural land in all of Canada, in the northern riches of York region, and it cannot be exported by rail to Kirkland Lake, though in fact it can be exported to Ohio with all of the attendant employment and economic spinoffs that the Ohio export in fact might produce.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I'll confirm that any proponent can carry out or proceed with an environmental assessment in cooperation with the branch on any proposal. The board would have to take into account government policy. In regard to the question of Ohio, I understand, and I don't want to misquote anyone else, that in media reports today Ohio officials have said, "Thanks, but no thanks" to GTA waste. I don't think that's very likely. However, I'm not sure what their processes are for approvals.

As a matter of fact, as was indicated in the House yesterday, I've expressed to the federal minister my desire for her to take action to close the border to ensure that the IWA process will be maintained in its integrity and that we will proceed to proper environmental assessments and that only those sites that are environmentally sound, as the Environmental Assessment Board finds them, could be approved.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** I regret profoundly that the official from my friend's office apparently was misquoted, because it was the first breath of fresh air in this crisis that we've experienced over the course of the past three years since Bill 143 was passed.

Let's just set out where we are. The minister's predecessor arbitrarily established that Metro's garbage was going to be dumped in York region and now in the city of Vaughan. Metropolitan Toronto rejects that solution. The people of York region reject that solution. The people of Vaughan reject that solution. A number of other proposals have been put on the table. The position of Metropolitan Toronto is that it will have to wait for the defeat of the NDP government before it gets on with it.

Yesterday, we were given to understand by the minister's officials that the Earth was changing a bit and that Metro could urgently get on with a consideration of the Kirkland Lake proposal.

I ask the minister simply to acknowledge and accede to Metropolitan Toronto's request, which would be supported throughout York region, and allow that environmental assessment to take place to determine whether or not the Kirkland Lake proposal is a viable one. Is that too much to ask of the minister? Is it too much to ask that this proposal—

**The Speaker:** Would the member complete his question, please.

**Mr Sorbara:** —be assessed by the best scientists and the best environmentalists in the world to determine whether it is better than digging a hole in the best farm land—

**The Speaker:** Would the member please conclude his question.

**Mr Sorbara:** —in Ontario and dumping Metro's garbage there? Is that too much to ask?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** If I can work through the member's verbiage about garbage, I will simply say to him what I've said for the last year and what my predecessor said before me, that if Metropolitan Toronto wishes to proceed as a proponent with an environmental assessment on a proposal to haul waste outside of the

GTA, it may do so, but the Environmental Assessment Board will of course take into account government policy and the law.

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** I'd like to follow up with the Minister of Environment on this whole issue of garbage and Metro's garbage and the eligibility of shipping to Ohio and maybe the eligibility of Kirkland Lake or not and the confusion that exists now in the minds of many people in Ontario.

Minister, can you confirm to me that there is nothing in your government policy or illegal about Orangeville shipping its garbage to the United States as it is doing today?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Unfortunately, since the federal government opened the border, that is the case.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Orangeville can do it, but Metro can't. What a policy.

**Mr Harris:** Can you explain—

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** You're dead wrong.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Harris:** Can you explain to me why it is okay for Orangeville to have its garbage finally deposited in the United States but it's not okay for Metro?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I don't think it's okay, and apparently, through media reports, neither do the people in Ohio, at least.

**Mr Harris:** Then, Minister, if you don't think it's okay, why don't you stop it?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** As the member will know, I mentioned in the House yesterday that I've written to the current minister and suggested an interim approach that might make it economically less viable to ship to the United States. I requested the current minister as well to close the border. I requested the previous two ministers as well to close the border.

**Mr Stockwell:** Orangeville garbage doesn't smell as much.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I wish that the members across the way would join me in taking a responsible approach and encouraging their federal colleagues to ensure that we deal with our waste here—

**Mr Stockwell:** Oh sure, what about Orangeville?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** —responsibly in this province rather than shipping it to neighbours elsewhere.

**The Speaker:** The member for Etobicoke West is out of order. New question.

**Mr Harris:** There is absolutely nothing about your approach to Metro's garbage that anybody of a sound mind could call responsible or consistent or fair or the best possible—

**The Speaker:** Would the leader place his second question, please.

**Mr Harris:** —for the environment. You have no policy.

LORING DEER YARD

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** In the absence of the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Minister of



Natural Resources and just about everybody else in the government, my question—

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** Hey, take that back.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** Elmer's there.

**Mr Harris:** I said "just about everybody else." My question is to the deputy Deputy Premier for the day.

On Little River Road near North Bay there is a deer viewing station that's been built by volunteers and government dollars. The deer viewing station is there so that the public, parents with their children, can come in and view the largest deer yard, I believe, in North America, certainly the largest concentration of deer in the province.

Approximately 12,000 deer winter in the Loring yards. The Ministry of Natural Resources and other groups for a period of years, with volunteers and government dollars, have, when there are winters that are extreme, been feeding the deer. This year, they have been feeding these deer, which are suffering from starvation because of the very harsh winter.

Madam Deputy Deputy Premier, 15 of these deer have been shot so far this winter, yet the Ministry of Natural Resources is refusing to lay charges. How long does your government intend to allow the slaughter of these baited deer, coming to find food because they're starving, to go on?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I hope the member will understand that I don't have full information with respect to this item and that I would hope the Minister of Natural Resources on his return could provide you with a fuller answer.

My understanding of the issue, and this is only from personal knowledge in reading the newspaper articles up in the Almaguin news area, is that a number of deer were shot by members of the aboriginal community in that area and that in fact, unless it is in violation of policy after investigation of waste or whatever, there is an entitlement to take deer, although it is a practice with respect to the feeding station in this area that has been deplored by the chiefs of the aboriginal communities there.

I can't tell you at this time whether or not the Ministry of Natural Resources has concluded any investigation as to whether there were any improprieties. I would reference that question to the Minister of Natural Resources and undertake to get you a full answer from him.

1410

**Mr Harris:** Madam Minister, the Ministry of Natural Resources admits there is a safety risk. At an area where they used to encourage parents to bring children in to view the deer they are now posting that the public and their children may be in danger. Earlier this month a deer was shot less than 500 metres from where a man and his 15-year-old son were watching the deer. Families can no longer safely take their children to the viewing station. Yet the Ministry of Natural Resources and your government have made no move, either out of safety to humans or to the deer, to stop the slaughter.

I ask you this: Does something serious have to happen here to public health, as well as the violation of all principles of wildlife management, before you're going to

take action to stop this?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I am aware, certainly, that there have been signs posted in the area and of the most unfortunate situation of the deer that was killed in very close proximity to a person who was there. In fact last weekend I had intended to go to the Loring yards and decided, with the friends I was with, not to take that visit because of the shooting activity that had gone on in the area. So I am very aware of this.

What I'm unfortunately unable to provide the leader of the third party with is a response as to whether or not any investigations by the Ministry of Natural Resources have been concluded. It's not that I'm trying not to answer your question; I genuinely don't know the answer to that. As soon as the minister returns, we will undertake to get you that information.

**Mr Harris:** The Ministry of Natural Resources says it's completed its investigation. They're warning people not to go near because their safety may be in danger. That's the action they say they are going to take, or can take, at this point. Our offices, both myself and the member for Parry Sound, have been contacted by natives who are as upset at these shootings as we are. Two members of the Dokis first nations have said, and I read a quote from the North Bay Nugget:

"We are absolutely appalled at the thought that possibly someone from an aboriginal community is responsible for this reprehensible act. We, as aboriginals, applaud the efforts of those involved for their humane efforts to sustain the deer yard. Many aboriginals who believe in the interconnectedness of nature know full well the value of the efforts of the MNR staff and the volunteers."

I would ask you this, Minister: As the one in charge today, will you personally investigate and put a stop to the slaughter of defenceless deer, many of them pregnant, many of them starving, that are seeking food to get through this winter, and will you do it immediately?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** As I indicated in my response to the member's first question, I fully acknowledge the leadership position taken by the chiefs of the aboriginal communities in that area, who have deplored the action of these individuals, whoever they may be. It is very gratifying, the commitment that there is to the protection of deer and to building the herds and the conservation approach that exists in all communities, aboriginal and non-aboriginal, in that area.

I reiterate the commitment I have made in the responses to the first two questions, to undertake to raise this issue with the Minister of Natural Resources and ask him to respond directly to the member opposite.

#### TRANSFER PAYMENTS TO MUNICIPALITIES

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and in my mind it gets perhaps right at the heart of the credibility of the Rae government. Yesterday, Minister, you will be aware that in the House the message was that the grants to municipalities and other of our partners were going to remain the same next year as this year. That was the message.

Today, as we make phone calls to ministry officials, we find that is not the case. We find that actually the grants are going to be reduced by 2%. The message we got yesterday was completely incorrect. The ministry officials and the Minister of Education say they were misquoted. It came straight out of the Ministry of Finance that the grants are being reduced by 2%. As I say, it gets right at the heart of the credibility, because I think most municipalities across this province breathed a sigh of relief yesterday.

Can the minister confirm that this is in fact what is happening, that you are not holding the grants at the level they were last year into next year, but that you actually are reducing the grants to municipalities by 2%?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** I can tell you that we're holding them at the 1993 level, which is what we told them last year. The Treasurer and I met with AMO representatives this morning. They're very happy in fact with the announcement we made yesterday and I can confirm that they went away quite pleased at the responsible way in which this government is handling things under tough times.

**Mr Phillips:** I go back to the credibility issue because, as I say, we took at face value the message you had yesterday, and that was that the grants to municipalities and school boards would remain the same next year as this year. The numbers we have would indicate that the school board grants are being reduced by 2%, that they aren't being held the same. The grants to municipalities, to use the language that the minister would use, the unconditional grants, are \$700 million in this fiscal year. In the next year, the year that's just coming up, they will be \$660 million, partially as the result of a 2% reduction in the grants.

What we want is a clear, straightforward answer from the government, because the answer we got this morning from ministry officials specifically was that there has somehow or other been a misinterpretation and that the grants are actually being reduced by 2%, that they're not being held even. I wonder if the minister might clarify that because it's right at the heart of credibility for the government. Are you holding the grants at the same level or are you reducing them by 2%? Can you give us a clear, unequivocal answer on that?

**Hon Mr Philip:** We're honouring our commitments. Last year we gave a one-time-only 2% grant, which they clearly understood. They understood it. You may not have understood it, but they understood it. They understood it this morning. They understood it last year.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Minister, since your government took office in 1990 you have reduced accountability in Ontario's welfare system, and you've expanded eligibility over the course of the last three and a half years. One example is the removal of home visits and expanded eligibility criteria and others.

The Ontario PC caucus, under the leadership of Mike Harris, has pleaded with you and your government in this

House to better monitor a system which is growing too quickly, without the fiscal integrity the taxpayers expect of a \$6.4-billion expenditure for 1.4 million citizens on social assistance.

Last year, I shared with you an eight-point plan from our caucus to improve integrity in that system, but faced with the lack of leadership from your government, municipalities have had to go it primarily on their own to develop systems of increased integrity for our social assistance system. Communities from across the province are reporting millions of dollars of savings based on those initiatives.

My question is simply this: A year ago I tabled in this House a report from the province of Quebec that indicates changes in provincial legislation which provide for an almost 75% ability to catch fraud and overpayment in the system when eligibility officers are empowered with this legislation.

After a year of sharing this with you, can you report to this House if you're prepared to make legislative amendments to assist the eligibility review officers in municipalities all across Ontario so that they can catch the fraud and return the taxpayer dollars to the provincial treasury?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** What I can tell the honourable member is that we take the issue of dealing and having to deal with abuse in the system quite seriously, and rather than spend our time bringing legislation as he's called for to help us deal with this issue, we have been working away at dealing with it within the existing guidelines we have and the existing powers, which are significant, to address the issues of abuse, eligibility and overpayment in the system. Already we have managed to make some significant improvements in the system.

#### 1420

He quite correctly points out that there is a dual responsibility in the system, both by the provincial government and by the municipalities, which run about half of our system, to do likewise. I'm glad to see that many municipalities have in fact built upon the initiatives we have undertaken, which have already saved hundreds of millions of dollars in terms of tighter eligibility and tightening up of the rules and making sure, therefore, that the people who receive the benefits are the people who are eligible.

I've been saying that we are working on further initiatives, which I hope to outline as early as next week, which will position us well to add to the steps we have taken to ensure that the system is much freer of abuse than it has been so far.

**Mr Jackson:** Minister, you're quoted in today's press as saying that with all these announcements that we've been waiting for for over a year and a half, you hope to save about \$50 million. That's in this morning's press. The fact is that the savings that could be achieved in the greater Toronto area alone could be well in excess of \$100 million to \$150 million if some of these legislative changes were implemented in concert with an expansion of the number of eligibility review officers in municipalities across Ontario.



I want to remind you of some of these numbers. In Halton, for an investment of \$75,000, they report savings to taxpayers of \$800,000. In the city of Hamilton, just on pure fraud alone, for a lesser investment they are saving nearly a full \$1 million, and that's on top of the other savings they have initiated in their municipality that are not being initiated in other municipalities because your government hasn't shown the initiative.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jackson:** One more example, in Brockville—

**The Speaker:** Would the member please place a question.

**Mr Jackson:** My question is: Why is it that in the community of Brockville, with 21,000 people, after investing \$30,000 in one review officer they can save that municipality a quarter of a million dollars? Minister, when will you stand in the House and provide strengthened legislation to allow the municipalities to do the job they're asking you to let them do?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I don't think the member wants to hear what I've said, but I'll try to repeat it for him. We are doing exactly those things. The instances he has quoted are not happening because municipalities have just decided on their own that they should do them; they're also happening because we're cofunding them to do exactly those things he has mentioned.

I can tell him that we are going to be doing more of that. There are going to be more funds provided to municipalities for them to do their part of the job in ensuring that we do appropriate investigations, that we do appropriate reviews to ensure that only those people who are eligible to receive social assistance benefits are receiving them. I will be very happy to stand in this House next week and outline in greater detail for the member and for the public some further steps we are taking in this respect.

#### HIGHWAY WIDENING

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Many of my constituents have asked me about the status of the Queen Elizabeth Way widening project that runs through my riding. Many feel that winter's bitter cold has stopped the shovel going into the ground to complete the project. You have to understand that the Queen E was built close to 55 years ago in that particular section, which is a bottleneck to the residents of Niagara, and here we've got the traffic of the 1990s going on a 55-year-old highway. Can the minister update this House and my constituency on the status of this very important project?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** A very timely question vis-à-vis a catalytic order when it comes to exports and imports in this special part of Ontario. Suffice it by way of an opportunity to give a brief update or broadly summarize what's happening out there: The contracts that were let out, the submissions that came in two years ago, will be completed on time, within budget, this spring. The submissions of 1993, last year, are also on time and within budget and shall be completed in 1995. Simply put, the big picture: total

widening of the Queen Elizabeth Way by the year of Our Lord 2000, not a day after. We're on time, we're on schedule and we welcome the opportunity and of course the question and the interest.

**Mr Hansen:** The other part of it, and this is a concern in the Niagara area, is the number of jobs that have been created to date on this section of the highway and the number that will be hired for the completion of this project.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** We've been through difficult times. The reason why Premier Rae and this government are focusing on jobs, jobs, jobs—and we mean what we say, 400 jobs so far; 500 to 600 jobs this year again in 1994 to be added to the 400 jobs, and a total—hear me, with the highest of respect—of 5,000 jobs. We have the diversity, shovel in the ground. The multiplier at Transportation is 2.5: For every dollar that is being spent, \$2.50 is to be augmented, supplemented.

This is a win-win-win situation. The taxpayers are getting their money back. It's putting people to work when they need it the most. Like most good things in life, it starts in the spring and it doesn't leave you when you need it the most. This is year-round work.

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** My question is to the Minister of Health, if she resumes her seat. The minister will know that there is a critical shortage of dialysis service across Ontario and a particular dialysis crisis in Toronto. Last month, the minister received a letter from the Toronto Dialysis Committee which charged that the Ministry of Health had behaved in an irresponsible way in failing to provide adequate dialysis service for the people of Ontario. A year ago, you were told that all dialysis programs are saturated to a dangerous level. I'd like to know from the Minister of Health what she intends to do to ensure that people with kidney disease who require dialysis don't die.

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** The member is right that in fact the demand and the need for dialysis is increasing very greatly, and hospitals and facilities, as well as the ministry, are struggling with how to both meet the current demand and ensure that as we plan for the future we are able to accommodate that growing need. I know the member for Simcoe West has certainly raised the issue with me with respect to his particular area.

I'm pleased to be able to say to the member that the three-year expansion which we began in 1991 and which will be completed in March 1994 means that we have opened a new haemodialysis unit in Mississauga. We've provided one-time funding to the Toronto Hospital to provide services for 18 patients on an interim basis until the Mississauga unit is open. We have expanded with new facilities in Orillia so that people from Simcoe county no longer have to come to Toronto and the pressure is lessened in the Metropolitan Toronto area, and the funding for haemodialysis has been increased significantly over the past five years.

There is, I recognize, more to be done, but I can assure her that it is an issue which we and the hospitals are working constructively to resolve.

**Mrs Sullivan:** The minister will know, by example, that the funding that was shifted from the Sussex Centre to the Toronto hospitals has expired this month. Patients are being required to stay in hospital for up to two and a half months because there are no outpatient facilities for them. The planning that's being done doesn't take into account that there will be 200 more patients in Toronto. The decisions that have been made mean that the number of new machines that are coming on stream won't even cover the backlog, let alone the number of new cases.

Once again, I'm asking the Minister of Health what specifically she is going to do and what urgent action she is going to take to ensure that people with kidney disease who need dialysis will get it and do not have to face the choice of death.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** The member says that the planning we are doing does not take into account the need. I regret to have to say to her that she is in fact quite wrong about that. The six district health councils in the central region were funded some months ago to do an urgent report about the need, taking into account that there has been a 10% increase in need. Their report, which is expected within the next couple of months, will provide the basis for the planning that must be done.

Having completed the first phase of our expansion, we expand in a way that anticipates the growth and provides those services in the most flexible way possible. It is not merely an extension of facilities in-hospital; it's whether we can expand in-home dialysis or whether we can provide satellites so that people can find the service as close as possible to where they live so that they can maintain as much as possible of their independence and normal lives despite kidney failure.

1430

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** My question is also to the Minister of Health. Minister, you'd be aware, and all members would be aware, that on December 9 this Legislature passed my private member's resolution which called upon your government to establish haemodialysis satellites in the towns of Collingwood and New Tecumseth in my riding of Simcoe West. You are also aware that many patients outside the greater Toronto area have to travel long distances, often over treacherous road conditions. They have to go to either Orillia or Toronto to receive this life-sustaining treatment.

I want to make sure you understand the effect your foot-dragging is having on the haemodialysis patients. Last month, more than 200 people attended a meeting in Alliston to discuss the government's inaction on the resolution that was passed by this Legislature in December. At that meeting, the most astonishing thing happened, and I didn't think I'd ever see this sort of thing happen at a public meeting in my lifetime. I want to read to you a line from the local paper reporting on that public meeting.

It says: "The most telling moment came from a member of the audience who faced trips to Toronto or faced losing his life. Mr Alvin Hiltz said 'I can't do it any longer. I'm going to quit.'" At a public meeting with 200 people, Mr Hiltz told us that he wasn't going to go back to Toronto, that he can't stand three days a week of

having to get on a bus in Alliston at 8 in the morning, travel two and a half hours by bus to Toronto—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place his question, please.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** —and take a taxi to his hospital. On the round trip, he's not back to Alliston by 8 at night. The days he's not required to drive to Toronto, he sits in front of the window in the wintertime wondering—

**The Speaker:** Could the member please place a question.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** —whether the weather is good enough that he gets to Toronto tomorrow to save his life.

Minister, your foot-dragging has gone on long enough. What are you going to do for the dialysis patients in my riding, and for those outside of Toronto, who have to face this sort of life which is no life at all?

**The Speaker:** The question's been asked.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I'm sorry that the member characterizes as foot-dragging what I believe has been a very real and timely response to the needs he has advocated for so well on behalf of his constituents. I don't know whether both of my critics are teaming up on questions, but, as I said in response to the question just before, we have expanded. In fact, it was the expansion of the Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital which was designed to meet the needs of people in Simcoe county who could more easily, we believed and many of them believed, get to Orillia as opposed to having to come to Toronto, which I recognize can be exceptionally onerous.

The \$23-million expansion that has occurred over the last three years has included the Orillia expansion, and the study I spoke about earlier that is looking at the future needs of the central Ontario region will address the issues the member has raised and the additional needs there may be in the future in Simcoe County.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I don't think that's a good enough or compassionate enough answer coming from this government, in particular during the month of March, Kidney Foundation Month.

Minister, we first heard about this central Ontario dialysis study last September, and I was told at that time, and we were told publicly, that that study would take six months to complete. In October, you put out a press release announcing this \$100,000 study all over again, and again we were told six months to complete.

Some seven months later, you're only getting around this week to having the first full-fledged meeting of that study committee, and not all of the appointees are yet assigned to the committee. So your study is going nowhere, and the people of my riding and in central Ontario and those outside of the GTA have no faith in this study.

Between your government and the government before you, you've closed 6,000 hospital beds and laid off thousands of hospital workers and nurses. You sold this initiative to the public by saying you were going to beef up community-based services. With the social contract, we've seen a decline in community-based services.

My dialysis resolution calls upon you—

**The Speaker:** Could the member place a question.



**Mr Jim Wilson:** —to embrace a community-based solution to establish dialysis satellites so these people don't have to face the inhumane treatment you're forcing them to undergo.

Minister, why will you not embrace our community-based solution and set up dialysis satellites in my riding and across central Ontario? Why will you not do that?

**The Speaker:** The question's been asked.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** It is precisely to determine the need and, for example, the locations in which satellites might be located that the study is being undertaken.

Let me remind the member that the expansion of Soldiers' Memorial in Orillia provided for 16 more haemodialysis units, many of them from Collingwood, to go to Orillia. Two patients who are unable to travel to Orillia are being treated in their own homes with the help of a paid attendant, another Alliston area resident receives haemodialysis at home with the assistance of a home helper, and some others, yes, are still travelling to Toronto.

I know of the member's interest, and I know of the interest in the community that he has generated through his petition campaign. I hope all of that interest will be translated into documentation of very real need that can be part of the study that is costing \$100,000, in order that we have a plan and a direction for the future and meet the very real needs we can identify and plan for.

#### USE OF EDWARDSBURGH LAND

**Mr Paul R. Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings):** I have one single, succinct question I'd like to place to the Chair of Management Board.

A recent article in the Brockville Recorder and Times insinuates that the government has left 10,500 acres of land in Edwardsburgh township, acquired for a planned industrial park, virtually undeveloped for the last two decades. As successive provincial governments have spent a total of \$15 million on this development, what are the current plans for these specific properties?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** I thank the member for his question. It points to some of the kinds of issues this government has found itself confronted with and trying to deal with.

The member is correct. The land assembly in Edwardsburgh was one of several land banks in the province of Ontario acquired in the mid-1970s, during the previous Tory administration of William Davis. The kinds of things that some had visions of developing on land banks like this have long since evaporated in the minds of not only those who dreamed them up but those who understand the reality of modern-day Ontario. In that respect, we are presently looking at making those lands available for appropriate residential development.

1440

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Supplementary? New question, the honourable member for Parkdale.

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale):** We have a serious problem today, Mr Speaker, inasmuch as almost half the cabinet is not present, including the Premier.

**The Speaker:** To whom is your question directed?

**Mr Ruprecht:** We have no indication today that the Minister of Citizenship—

**The Speaker:** No. Would the member take his seat, please. Our practice is for the member who's recognized to identify to whom he wishes to direct the question.

**Mr Ruprecht:** I have a question to the Minister of Citizenship, and I hope she arrives or that she is in the back or that she would be here. I've a serious concern: If she's not here and the Premier's not here and half the cabinet is not here—

**The Speaker:** Would the member take his seat. The member is asked to take his seat.

The member has one more opportunity. To whom does he wish to direct his question?

**Mr Ruprecht:** Mr Speaker, I don't see the Minister of Citizenship, so I will pass to my colleague Mr Daigeler.

#### HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I have a question to the Minister of Transportation. You will be, I'm sure, very familiar with the fact that your Premier has tried to spend at least, and that's the minimum, \$1 billion to encourage the Metro Toronto area to build four subway lines rather than two. Some people said he went quite a bit further than just to encourage Metro; some people say he even tried to blackmail them. Be that as it may, it is clear that the Premier has tried, so far unsuccessfully, to spend at least \$1 billion extra in the Metro Toronto area. Metro Toronto, as is its right and its responsibility, has said: "No. At this point, we want to build only two subways. It's going to cost us enough. Perhaps later on, we'll build four subways."

If my calculation is right, the Premier and the Treasurer and the cabinet have \$1 billion left over, because they wanted and they still want to spend an extra \$1 billion in the Metro Toronto area. Minister, we in eastern Ontario have a project ready to go, on which we want to spend not a whole billion dollars, but approximately \$200 million, and that project is called Highway 416. In view of the fact that this province is not spending \$1 billion, will you redirect some of that money and reinstitute the completion of 416 in eastern Ontario?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** When it comes to infrastructure programs, the presence of the Premier borders on the proverbial. We are committed to our share, the major portion of the cost vis-à-vis the four projects in Metro Toronto. We have an equally important presence, by way of \$900 million, on highways across the province of Ontario.

We also have a flagship through the capital corporation vis-à-vis Highway 407 to ease the traffic from Highway 401. It's the largest construction project in North America. More money is being spent on 416 north than ever before. When it comes to 416 south, it would be very nice to have the cooperation from the federal Liberal government.

We're the only province that doesn't get a penny in terms of a national highway program. It leaves us with two highways, a Trans-Canada highway and a trans-Ontario highway.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude his remarks, please.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** The motorists of the province of Ontario sent \$1.15 billion of their hard-earned dollars to Ottawa and we don't see a dime, a nickel, not a penny—

**The Speaker:** Would the minister please conclude his reply.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** We want to build the 416. We want to accelerate the 416, but we need help to do so.

**Mr Daigeler:** Minister, you don't need to go on. I can recognize somebody skating on thin ice when I see it, but I think you have to be careful that you don't break through this ice.

I'm not asking you to spend more money. All I'm saying is that the Premier, according to his own commitment that he wanted to spend in Metro—Metro doesn't want it, so he's got \$1 billion at least that he can spend in other areas of the province.

I'm asking you again. Never mind the federal government. This is money your Premier is ready to spend now. That's what he has said, that he is ready to spend that money now. Metro doesn't want it. Will you spend that money, or at least part of that money, in eastern Ontario for the 416? We in eastern Ontario want the 416 completed.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** This is very important. Some of his colleagues might judge my good critic and friend with a vengeance, for they will feel the question is parochial; that as the critic for Transportation he has failed to see the big picture and is now preaching for his parish. Well, it's not so. He is very much aware.

I sympathize with the kind of pressure he's under. He has seen the federal government spend millions and millions of dollars from Ottawa to Hull, but only on the Hull side. He's even contemplated, because of the one-way flow of traffic—but those people have to come back—maybe enlarging the bridge separating Hull from Ottawa, for ulterior motives. I don't know, but I read papers.

Let me conclude on the very real subject matter which is the 416, a major lifeline, that if we were to be innovative, if we were to be imaginative and have an entrepreneur, maybe a group of entrepreneurs—

**The Speaker:** Would the minister please conclude his reply, please.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** —come up with a proposal, maybe use the transportation corporation to help us in the collective, working as a team in a partnership, we would have to be at least—

**The Speaker:** Would the minister please conclude his reply.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** —committed to give that proposal consideration. I welcome the inquiry.

#### STUDENT ASSISTANCE

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** I have a question for the Minister of Education and Training. Yesterday the minister stated that he had called on the federal government to work with the provinces to develop a system whereby graduates pay back student loans based on their income once they're in the workforce.

I am glad he has New Directions, Volume Two, with him. I am very proud to say that the minister does take the time to read and to follow through where good information and good plans are in place. But yesterday the minister missed a golden opportunity. It had nothing to do with the Blue Jays. He could have at the same time announced income-contingent loan repayment plans, and he didn't do it. The students are very disappointed and not, therefore, supportive.

When are you going to announce the income-contingent loan repayment plans so the students can be 100% behind you in your support of the universities?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** It's quite simple. Because there is a thing called the Canada student loan program and the Ontario student assistance program, you cannot move forward with an income-contingent repayment program until the two programs are integrated.

In the current federal government, Minister Axworthy has indicated that they have some interest in this and that they're prepared to work with the province to develop some options. We want to do that very much with the federal government. I must say, this is one instance where I am actually saying there might be something positive—might be—to say about the federal government.

This government has indicated that it might be interested in doing that, as opposed to the previous government, which was about to privatize the Canada student loan program and rule out any option on income contingencies.

**Mrs Cunningham:** I want to talk about the future. In fact, it's very important to the future that we support our universities. Yesterday the minister talked about injecting new funds into the universities, sometimes at the expense of the students, so I am going to ask this question now.

Minister, as we work together to get this program moving as quickly as possible, because there are so many young people who just cannot pay back these loans, who in fact can't get them without this kind of plan, how are you going to include the students as part of this whole process of defining this plan and how it will work, along with your consultation with the federal government?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** We, along with the universities, are pulling together a symposium that will take a look at the various options in terms of income contingency which will involve students, administration, board members and the federal government. The date's been set; it's in the very near future. We intend very much to involve the students in the design of the program.

1450

#### MASSEY CENTRE FOR WOMEN

**Mr Gary Malkowski (York East):** I have a question for the Minister of Housing. I have been very supportive of our government's work on the residents' rights bill, which proposes to extend Landlord and Tenant Act rights to vulnerable residents.

Recently it has come to my attention at the Massey Centre for Women in my riding of York East that it may be adversely affected by this bill. The Massey Centre provides programs for pregnant teenagers and single



mothers and their children in the areas of counselling, life skills, day care, education and employment in pre- and post-natal transitional housing.

The Massey Centre has been exempt from the LTA and wishes to continue to have this exemption as it is not in the business of providing permanent housing. Minister, will the Massey Centre continue to be exempted under the LTA?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** I welcome the question. The Massey Centre is a very interesting and successful organization and in no way would the government wish to see its operations in any sense undermined. We're very, very supportive of the programs they've been running.

In fact, they are running three programs: The pre-natal counselling service which they provide won't be affected by Bill 120. The second part of their programming, and it's a distinct program, is a program which provides up to six months of accommodation under close supervision and support service for young mothers who've just delivered their babies, and that won't be affected either. It will be exempted under the provision in Bill 120 in which a six-month program does not have the application of the Landlord and Tenant Act. The third part of the program is the longer-term, second-stage housing, and there the Landlord and Tenant Act will apply to that second-stage housing. We also have made an amendment to Bill 120 which will mean that for a program of that nature, which is under two years, they will be able to ask people to leave once the program has been completed.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The time for oral questions has expired.

#### ATTENDANCE OF MINISTERS

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale):** Mr Speaker, on a point of privilege: I am preparing my questions on the basis that a certain minister is present. It is common among the House leaders that this is being done under routine proceedings, and everyone is informed if a minister is not present. In this case ministers were not present and they're not listed here. Could you check into this so that in the future this will not happen?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for Parkdale, an experienced member, will know that the Chair is not privy to pieces of paper which indicate who may or may not be present in the chamber on any particular day or at any given time and cannot be of any assistance to the member.

I realize the House tries to conduct itself in an orderly way and provide members with names of those who are expected to be present. That is not information which is shared with the Chair, nor should it be. I regret that I'm unable to be of assistance to the member in this instance.

#### VISITOR

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: We have the crime fighter from Cornwall here with us today, His Worship Mayor Ron Martelle from Cornwall.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member does not have a point of order, but the mayor of Cornwall is most welcome in our chambers.

#### CORRECTION

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I wish to correct the record in respect to comments I made during debate on a justice committee report this Monday. In respect to witnesses who appeared before the justice committee, I was critical of the testimony delivered by the East York Tenants' Association, mistakenly. In fact the contribution of the East York Tenants' Association I thought was very positive, unlike some of the other witnesses. I mistakenly criticized the East York Tenants' Association when the comments should have been directed towards Mr Kenneth Hale of the Tenant Advocacy Group.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** We appreciate the fact that the honourable member has corrected his own record.

#### MOTIONS

##### COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTION

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that the following substitution be made to the membership of the standing committee on public accounts: Mr Crozier for Mr Murphy.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

##### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that Mr Harris and Mr Cousens exchange places in the order of precedence for private members' public business.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

#### PETITIONS

##### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I have two petitions. If you will allow me, they go together. They're both from the congregation, the men and women at the Christ Our King Lutheran Church in Mississauga.

The first is to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all such references should be removed from the code."

The second one, to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, with regard to:

"Bill 55 will make it illegal for people to make any public statement, written or oral, which ridicules,

demeans or discriminates against a person on the grounds of sexual orientation. This is a grave threat to free speech in a democratic society.

"Bill 55 is also an attack on freedom of religion, against historical Christianity, which does not condone homosexuality.

"We want to maintain our basic right to disagree with homosexuality, which in no way should be equated with hatred.

"We have moved away from a position where some homosexuals and other special-interest groups are no longer content to express their ideas, but are demanding that contrary views be suppressed with stiff penalties.

"At the same time, these special-interest groups will be allowed to teach their controversial alternative lifestyles to youngsters in the classrooms, thereby proselytizing children with their viewpoints without allowing for differing opinions."

I've affixed my signature to both petitions in agreement.

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I wish the member for Mississauga West had been a member when his party put this change in the code.

I have a petition from Christ Our King Lutheran Church. It has a large number of names, and I'm happy to read this petition and present it to the House.

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and may include sadomasochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics such as race, religion, age and sex, we believe all such references should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

I'm happy to sign this petition.

1500

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** I have a petition to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliamentary of Ontario as follows in regards to Bill 45."

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters' advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we're not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Premier and the Legislative Assembly to change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

It is signed by 117 constituents. I affix mine.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** I have a petition that came to me from Sandra Dennis in Kitchener, signed by 50 people.

"To Premier Bob Rae and Health minister Ruth Grier:

"We, the undersigned, residents of a long-term care facility in Ontario, spouses, other family members, friends and interested parties need your help.

"Many couples whose combined income is needed for the spouse in a long-term care facility and the spouse still residing independently in the community will be unable to continue paying the new rates, which were recently increased 41% or \$376.18 per month. Single and widowed residents are also affected by increases.

"Also, we are worried about the reduction of the hours of nursing care. We believe the reduction jeopardizes the safety and wellbeing of the residents.

"Consequently, more health care dollars may be spent to cover the cost of any repercussions from the reduction. We are proud Canadians and desperately need your help regarding these two serious matters."

#### WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I've got a petition here sent to me by Peter Williamson from the Williamson GM dealer in Uxbridge.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ontario Workers' Compensation Board decision to increase the assessment rates to over 27,000 Ontario employers in excess of 25%, to 90,000 in excess of 10% and to over two thirds of Ontario business in excess of 3% will cost jobs; and

"Whereas the WCB ignored the responsible plan from the business community; and

"Whereas the WCB did not consult with business before making this reckless decision; and

"Whereas the WCB chair, Mr O. Di Santo, cast the deciding vote to allow this irresponsible tax grab,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government roll back WCB assess-



ment rates, accept the business solution and demand the full resignation of WCB chair Mr Di Santo."

There are a lot of people who have problems with the Workers' Compensation Board, including injured workers out there. Something needs to be done.

#### TUITION FEES

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a petition from a number of young people concerned about tuition and it reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the NDP promised throughout many election campaigns to eliminate tuition fees for college and university students; and

"Whereas the NDP broke this election promise in its first year in office; and

"Whereas, since the NDP took office, they have already raised tuition fees by 22% and are planning to raise tuition fees by an additional 14% over the next two years"—that turned out to be 20%, by the way—"and

"Whereas the NDP government has cut over \$250 million in funding to colleges and universities, forcing many institutions to raise non-tuition student fees to make up for the missing revenue; and

"Whereas the government has cut the student grants program for post-secondary students and replaced it with a smaller loans program; and

"Whereas everyone agrees that we need to encourage students to become more highly trained and skilled through post-secondary education to ensure that our province can compete in the changing economy; and

"Whereas student unemployment is at an all-time high, double-digit levels already, leaving further education as the only hope for real jobs for our young people,

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, urge the province of Ontario to restore equality and accessibility to the post-education system by holding the line on tuition increases and making it more affordable for our youth to receive the skills and training they require."

I agree with these young people and I affix my signature to this petition.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have two similar petitions from different areas of my riding. I'll only read the one into the record.

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Liberal Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is

enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and therefore could include sado-masochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all references to sexual orientation should be removed from the Ontario Human Rights Code and Liberal Bill 45.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

I'm affixing my signature to both petitions.

#### RETAIL SALES TAX

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** I have a petition here signed by the owner, staff and patrons of Main West Brew in Hamilton expressing their opposition to the tax on beer and wine produced at brew-your-own premises.

#### SALE OF LAND

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** I have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the NDP promised during the election campaign to protect agricultural areas surrounding Metropolitan Toronto for future development; and

"Whereas the NDP demanded during the last provincial election campaign that provincially owned land in the Pickering area known as Seaton should be used only to build affordable housing;" and I remember that, "and

"Whereas the NDP government is now planning to sell land in the Pickering area for private development because of its sagging revenues;

"We, the undersigned, petition the NDP government to stop its sale of the Pickering lands or call an election," which I much favour, "to measure the public's opinion of this mismanaged revenue scheme."

I affix my signature to this in full agreement.

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas several patients from the Collingwood area are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in the Collingwood area;

"Whereas the government continues to insist they are studying the problem, even though they have known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in Alliston and Collingwood,

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of Collingwood."

I've signed this petition.

## LAP DANCING

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** I have a petition which has been signed by a number of residents in my riding and it states:

"We, the undersigned, are opposed to the ruling on lap dancing in strip bars. We feel it's a violation of any code of morality or decency. We want steps taken to overturn this decision."

I present the petition on behalf of my constituents.

## SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** "To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Liberal Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

1510

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and may include sadomasochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, sex and age, we believe all such references should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing the Liberal Bill 45."

I've affixed my name.

## FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mrs Irene Mathyssen (Middlesex):** I have a petition addressed to the Premier, Solicitor General and the Legislative Assembly from the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. The federation wishes to indicate its objection to the decision by the province not to grandfather firearms acquisition certificates and safety courses. The federation requests that only first-time gun purchasers be required to take the federal firearms safety course and examination.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I have a petition to the Premier, Bob Rae, the Solicitor General and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the costs of another course or examination and we should

not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"I/We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

That's signed by 97 people from Orillia, Oro Station, Coldwater, Washago and Port Severn.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO  
AMENDMENT ACT, 1994LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LA MUNICIPALITÉ DE LA COMMUNAUTÉ  
URBAINE DE TORONTO

On motion by Mrs Marland, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 145, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act / Projet de loi 145, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la municipalité de la communauté urbaine de Toronto.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** The honourable member for Mississauga South: short comments.

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** This bill prevents the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto from passing a bylaw which would prevent cabs licensed by municipalities outside of the Metropolitan area from conveying physically, emotionally or mentally handicapped people from a point in the Metropolitan area to any point outside the Metropolitan area.

The bill is a response to the decision of Metro Toronto council to terminate its exemption for accessible taxis in the Metro bylaw which prohibits taxis which are licensed by municipalities outside Metro Toronto from picking up passengers in Metro. The exemption for accessible taxis is needed to ensure safe and timely transit services for disabled people who live outside Metropolitan Toronto but work, attend school or require services in Metro.

Accessible taxis supplement the accessible buses operated by regional paratransit services such as Transhelp in Peel region. Disabled residents of Peel make 30% of their trips to and from Metro in accessible taxis rather than Transhelp buses. There is a shortage of accessible taxis within Metropolitan Toronto, whereas some municipalities such as the regional municipality of Peel have made excellent progress in the acquisition of accessible taxis.

Metro's accessible taxis will not be able to provide the services needed by the disabled persons from other municipalities. Moreover, with the need and demand for more accessible taxis in Metro, the bylaw exemption did not pose any risk to the business success of Metro Toronto's cab companies.

I hope the government will give my private member's bill a high priority in order to avoid the impending transit crisis for disabled residents of the municipalities surrounding Metro Toronto.



## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Government House Leader.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** The 36th order.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** The 36th order: second reading, Bill 143, An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and to amend the Education Act in respect of French-Language School Boards. Mr Philip.

## OTTAWA-CARLETON LEGISLATION

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** Point of order, Mr Speaker: I rise on a point of order regarding Bill 143, which is formally entitled "An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and to amend the Education Act in respect of French-Language School Boards."

The government, as you know, just introduced this bill on Tuesday of this week, two days ago, to replace Bill 77 which was originally introduced for first reading on July 22, 1993.

The major difference between these two bills is that Bill 143 also deals with a totally separate and different matter, and that is that it amends the Education Act in relation to French-language school boards in Ottawa-Carleton.

My concern is with the form of Bill 143. I feel this bill goes beyond the generally accepted form for legislation and is using an omnibus format that is inconsistent with the practice of omnibus bills.

The sixth edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms states that, "Speakers have expressed deep concern about the use of omnibus bills." Omnibus bills are generally accepted to be bills that demand a decision on a number of quite different although related subjects. However, the only thing the Education Act and the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Act have in common is that they affect the same geographical area. Otherwise, these two statutes are not related subjects. One deals with restructuring of municipal and local government in Ottawa-Carleton; the other deals with the restructuring of the French-language school boards in Ottawa-Carleton.

School boards are autonomous from municipalities and as such these two issues should be separated in two different issues.

I also want to read from a debate which took place in the House of Commons in 1988 over the Canada free trade agreement. At that particular time, this same point of order was raised by several members. I want to refer to certain portions of that, which referred back to Mr Speaker Lamoureux, who on January 26, 1971, said:

"However, where do we stop? Where is the point of no return? The honourable member for Winnipeg North Centre, and, I believe the honourable member for Edmonton West, said that we might reach the point where we would have only one bill, a bill at the start of the session for the improvement of the quality of life in Canada which would include every single proposed piece

of legislation for the session. That would be an omnibus bill with a capital 'O' and a capital 'B.' But would it be acceptable legislation? There must be a point where we go beyond what is acceptable from a strictly parliamentary standpoint."

Mr Speaker, in this particular instance, as you may know, over the past half-year since Bill 77 was introduced, the varying political parties of this Legislature have talked about their acceptance of Bill 77. Some speculate that there may be closure moved on this particular bill, and I believe that is a reasonable expectation for the government to assume may be required of it in order to carry this bill through.

If that is the case and we combine the concern of previous British parliamentary institutions with our now standing orders, which were changed, as you may remember, two years ago, where it allows the government under standing order 46(c) to move a time allocation motion after three sessional days on second reading have been considered, that means that we could in effect have the government move an omnibus bill for the good of the government of Ontario and include everything from A to Z within that bill and allow this Legislature three days to debate all of those matters and vote for them in one lot. It may be of advantage to members of the Legislature, because quite frankly we'd probably only get a week or two of sittings, and that might be acceptable to a lot of us. Notwithstanding that, this bill does not go to that extent, obviously, but it does introduce two very different matters which we are to consider there.

Another parliamentary principle which you would not have to rule on at this point in time if in fact you found against my particular argument would be a request which I may make at a later date that the two issues be separated on second reading so that we could have a vote on these two very important matters, ie, one on the general thrust of the legislation which is being put forward by this government to restructure the regional government of Ottawa-Carleton, and on the other hand the very different matter of the restructuring of the French-language school boards in Ottawa-Carleton.

There are approximately 18,000 students who will be affected by the restructuring of the Ottawa-Carleton French-language school boards. In a meeting which I had yesterday with officials of the Ministry of Education and Training, they indicated to me that this section of the bill was not an urgent matter to deal with. That was their message to me.

It appears to me that adding together the repartee that has existed between the opposition parties and the government party over the past six months with regard to this bill along with the fact that the Education Act amendments which deal with French-language school boards have been introduced only two days ago, which gives neither me nor my colleagues in the opposition the opportunity to go back to our constituencies and allow us enough time to talk to those 18,000 parents or their representatives, not only the trustees but the other people in the community, the parents of those 18,000 students, quite frankly we are left in a conundrum, in terms of knowing the arguments which may be put forward, as to

whether or not we should vote for this particular bill on second reading. I am talking about the French-language school board part of the bill.

I think that the pacing of this legislation is disastrous. It is unfair to the people that are involved in it to ask members of this Legislature to decide on the outcome of these particular school boards in a period of two days and expect us to come back in the Legislature in two days and be able to make our decision on second reading.

I also want to say that the Speaker, as I understand the parliamentary rules, has the option of dividing issues on second reading. I must add, though, Mr Speaker, in fairness to you, that no Speaker to my knowledge in Canada has taken that option to date. But I encourage you to consider that if in fact you rule against me in terms of allowing this bill to proceed as it has been presented to the Legislature today.

I believe it would have been much better for the government to continue on with Bill 77 and not proceed with Bill 143 and then introduce another bill to deal with the separation of the two French-language school boards away from the amalgamated school board, as they have it now. That would permit proper hearings, proper consultation etc to deal with that. Quite frankly, as I now stand I am probably in favour of the separation of those school boards because it's not working at the present time.

The issue is also complicated by the fact that one of the two school boards is under trusteeship at the present time, although there is a hope by the Ministry of Education and Training that this problem will be resolved in the very near future.

I would hope that through our parliamentary process, if in fact I am ruled against in terms of Bill 143, we will have the opportunity to travel to Ottawa in order to hear various people talk about these two bills.

If we go at the present time on the French-language school boards issue, we will hear people talking about the trusteeship. We will not be hearing them talk about whether or not these two boards should be under an umbrella French-language school board for Ottawa-Carleton or a Catholic school board and a public school board under the French sector in Ottawa-Carleton.

So I think the timing is ill in a political sense, but I also believe that the government should be restricted to stay to its course which it had previously put forward on July 22. I believe that their notice to the francophone community in Ottawa-Carleton is inadequate in terms of allowing them time to contact me, my other colleagues from the Ottawa-Carleton area, the other members of this Legislature, to let them know what their feelings are about this very important issue for 18,000 students in the Ottawa-Carleton area.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** I thank the member for Carleton. He brings a very interesting perspective. Does the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs want to react to the same point of order?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** On the same point of order, and I'll be brief, the bill that we have before us deals with the restructuring of Ottawa-Carleton. It's based on the Kirby report and on other

studies that have gone on before, to find ways in which the Ottawa-Carleton region could be managed in a more efficient way and a more representative way.

In Kirby, what we have is a clear call for a study to look at the governance, if you want, of school boards in the Ottawa-Carleton area. As a result of Kirby, the Minister of Education took Mr Kirby's recommendation and in fact acceded to that recommendation. The Minister of Education and Training requested that a study be taken and indeed Mr Bourns of Peat Marwick Thorne had been appointed on May 10, 1993, to undertake that study, the study again coming from the recommendation on which this bill is based.

Mr Bourns released his final report in November 1993, and in his report he recommended that the existing Ottawa-Carleton French-language school board be dissolved and that the two existing sectors become individual boards at the earliest possible time. That is precisely what has been done.

The Ministry of Education consulted extensively. Mr Bourns consulted extensively in Ottawa-Carleton. Indeed, as you know, the rationale for including this amendment in Bill 77 is that, first of all, Mr Bourns did this in response to the Kirby recommendations. But also, ward boundaries for school boards must follow municipal wards, and the municipal wards won't be established until royal assent of this bill. It makes absolutely logical and common sense to combine these two issues, the issues of the restructuring of both the municipal and the educational system under one bill. They come from the same report that was commissioned by the government, and I urge, Mr Speaker, that you rule that this bill is in order.

**The Acting Speaker:** We have a number of points of view here. I would beg the House to have a five-minute recess to look over the potential aspects of this bill. This House will now stand recessed for five minutes.

*The House recessed from 1524 to 1534.*

**The Acting Speaker:** I wish to thank the member for Carleton for bringing his concerns to the Speaker. I also want to thank the minister for his participation in debating the particular point of order. We find, however, with all due consideration, that it is an omnibus bill that indeed is in order and we will be proceeding with Bill 143 as it is provided by the minister. We do not feel, and I do not feel, the Chair should dictate to any cabinet member what should be in an omnibus bill.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON  
AND FRENCH-LANGUAGE SCHOOL BOARDS  
STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT DES LOIS CONCERNANT  
LA MUNICIPALITÉ D'OTTAWA-CARLETON  
ET LES CONSEILS SCOLAIRES  
DE LANGUE FRANÇAISE

Mr Philip moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 143, An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and to amend the Education Act in respect of French-Language School Boards / Projet de loi 143, Loi modifiant certaines lois relatives à la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et la Loi sur l'éducation en ce qui a trait aux conseils scolaires de langue française.



**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** The minister now has the floor to debate Bill 143.

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** I rise to present our views, the views of the government, on second reading of Bill 143, an act which will reform the regional government and French-language school boards in the region of Ottawa-Carleton.

Among the main features of the legislation are direct election of a regional council, to be in place in time for the 1994 civic elections; regional responsibility for policing under a regional police services board; a new role for a regional council in acquiring land for economic development purposes.

Resolution of the regional policing issue is long overdue. A large region such as Ottawa-Carleton needs and deserves a more coordinated approach to policing. It is also a question of fairness. This bill will help ensure that policing costs are fairly distributed across the tax base of the entire region and that all taxpayers contribute.

In addition, this bill will give the region an enhanced new role in economic development. Specifically, the region will have exclusive authority to acquire industrial, commercial and institutional lands for economic development purposes. The assignment of this authority to regional council is based on the recognition that Ottawa-Carleton is one economic community of interest.

One part of the legislation which has caused considerable concern is that local mayors will no longer sit on regional council. I've received letters and suggestions from the area mayors and I congratulate them on trying to find solutions to this issue.

However, this regional council is responsible for over \$1 billion a year in expenditures and we feel that electors are entitled to a regional governing structure comprised entirely of representatives who are directly accountable to them. Because there is a great disparity in the size of the municipalities in this area and because there are 11 mayors in the region, unlike other regions, representation by population can only be achieved when mayors no longer sit on this body.

There are many supporters of this approach, including Dave Bartlett, the author of the previous study on the future of Ottawa-Carleton; Claude Bennett, the former Progressive Conservative Minister of Municipal Affairs; the former and current chairs of the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade; the mayor and council of the city of Ottawa; the Ottawa Citizen; and the Federation of Ottawa-Carleton Citizens' Associations, not to mention numerous business people in the various communities who I've heard from.

This bill replaces Bill 77 which was introduced in the last session of the Legislature. This bill is being reintroduced because we have a number of additions to it. Some of these were necessary because the passage of the original bill was delayed. Because of this delay, we've been able to incorporate some of the education recommendations of the Bourns study which was originally proposed by Graeme Kirby in his final report on Ottawa-Carleton.

New provisions have been introduced to deal with the

operation of Ottawa-Carleton's French-language school board. The existing regulatory power to dissolve and create French-language school boards is being clarified and a few minor additions are being made in order to deal with the special circumstances of Ottawa-Carleton.

**1540**

There are provisions for the transfer of trustees, property, employees and assets and any other matters which may arise as a result of the creation of the new boards.

We have added to the existing police-related provisions the establishment of a regional police planning committee which is intended to begin work shortly on integrating the local municipal forces. We have extended the date for amalgamation of the three existing police forces to take place on or by January 1, 1997, and we've clarified the region's authority to phase in any changes in costs for policing.

I'm pleased to announce today that the regional municipality will receive, and I've just signed it this morning, a \$70,000 special assistance grant from the province to assist in a study to determine the present and future communication system needs of the regional police service established by this bill.

My staff informed the regional chair's office of this grant earlier today, since I wasn't able to reach him personally. This grant is intended to assist in only the first step of the amalgamation process, and other assistance, I can assure you, will be provided once further costs are known.

Provisions have been added to the bill which will ensure that the 1994 municipal and school board elections run smoothly. The Ontario Municipal Board is being given authority to make changes to the electoral areas of wards of school boards as a result of the changes to local, municipal or regional wards.

Finally, the street vending provisions from the previous bill have been corrected.

The popular sentiment in Ottawa-Carleton is that the region is vastly overgoverned, and streamlining is urgently needed.

The people of Ottawa-Carleton have waited a long time for this legislation. In the past several years, there have been three separate studies on the future of regional government in this area, most recently the Kirby commission, and the time has now come to act.

I ask that members of the House approve this legislation and allow it to pass expeditiously so that the new regional government is in effect for the 1994 civic elections. Delay of this legislation is already creating some difficulties for the region's clerks in terms of deadlines. Candidates for regional positions have already been inconvenienced by the delays in registration. The bottom line is that the time is here to end the uncertainty in Ottawa-Carleton and allow the citizens of Ottawa-Carleton to participate equally with other citizens in this province in the 1994 civic elections.

I thank you, Mr Speaker, and members of the House for any contributions they will be making to this debate.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you very much. Questions or comments?

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I guess what we're dealing with here today is a vision of municipal government. The provincial government has a certain vision of municipal government, and I think through this debate today and next week and hopefully through committee meetings—I don't know exactly what the minister has in mind. I'm not sure if he made any comments in that regard, but I do hope that at the end of the day, at the end of second reading, there will be an opportunity to have this bill debated in committee, because certainly there are a great number of people who have an interest in the vision of municipal government, particularly in the Ottawa-Carleton region.

I must say that this is being watched right across Ontario because this is viewed, I think, as being a bit of a forerunner of certainly this government's idea of municipal government, not only in Ottawa-Carleton but perhaps in Metropolitan Toronto, perhaps in the Hamilton region, perhaps in London, perhaps right across this province.

The vision this government has is of a regional government that is distinct from the local councils, an entirely distinct level of government—if you will, a fourth level of government—so that the region is quite distinct from the local municipal councils and there's no linkage between the two of them.

This is not a new model. This is a model that was attempted some time ago in the city of Winnipeg. It failed, and it failed miserably. It resulted in all sorts of problems, disputes between the local council and the regional council, and ultimately led to the demise of the local council so that now in the city of Winnipeg there's just one council, period. That's the route we're going with this particular government's proposal and I think that's what should be debated in the committee.

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** I too would implore the minister to have hearings on this matter, because local government is a very important affair to local people. It's awfully important to proceed with changes that are accepted by the local people or you proceed to have situations, conflicts, that are never forgotten. I think we have that situation in Haldimand-Norfolk. The minister has just recently visited there and agreed to a review to give people the opportunity to voice their opinions and make suggestions on changes that are perceived to be needed by many, many people, and perhaps a majority in that particular region.

It's so important to have acceptance of changes. The previous speaker mentioned that the system had been tried before, but I want to point out that in the county system of government the government changed the system, had direct election and had the counties divided into districts for electoral purposes with no membership from the local councils.

From 1898 to 1906 it did not work. It was a complete and dismal failure. It caused tremendous conflict between the local councils and the upper tier, and it was changed. It was a very needed and improved change when they went back to the old system. I agree that a combination of direct election with representation from area councils is needed for liaison back to the councils for a reminder of the important services. That's based on the fact that

services at the upper tier are indeed municipal services rendered on behalf of area municipalities.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** I'd like to clarify one point. The minister talked about delay with regard to this legislation. Everybody in Ontario should understand that there hasn't been one minute of delay on the part of any of the opposition parties to date. This bill was introduced for first reading on July 22 and took all of a period of about two minutes to pass on July 22, 1993.

This government chose not to debate this bill during the fall session, even though we sat for 60 or 70 days. The allegation that there's been delay may be true, but all of that delay must lie at the feet of the government at this point in time. I was anxious to debate this in the fall; I was ready to debate it in the fall; I was ready to debate it in December. The government did not see fit that this was a priority to debate until today.

I am further chagrined that they would introduce at the very last moment a brand-new concept into this bill, and that is the creation of the French-language public school board and the French-language Catholic school board. As I said in my point of order, I am very, very sorry that the people who use those systems, the parents of the 18,000 students who use those systems, will not have an adequate time to respond to this bill and will be grouped in with another agenda which has been deemed, on the government's part, to be urgent.

1550

**The Acting Speaker:** We can accommodate one final participant.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** I just want to say to the minister with regard to his introductory comments to the bill that I've had the opportunity to meet with a number of people around the Ottawa area especially with regard to the educational component of this bill, and I can say that most of the people I met with, actually all, are very much in agreement with trying to deal with this. I think most of us recognize that there is a very difficult situation in terms of the public and separate portion of the French-language school boards in Ottawa, where you had a board structured in such a way that you basically had three boards.

The people I've dealt with in the Ottawa community, the students, some teachers I happen to know there, as well as the people in administration and some of the people concerned, have been looking to the government, not only our government but actually to the government before us, the Peterson government, to move on this, because it's really quite a difficult situation they find themselves in.

I just want to say to the minister, on behalf of the people I spoke to in the Ottawa-Carleton area, that they're very much in favour of moving ahead in the direction we're going right now with this bill, to deal with that particular component, the educational component of the bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** This completes questions or comments. The honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs has two minutes in response.

**Hon Mr Philip:** The member for Don Mills was quite



correct. This does show, and the debate will show, a vision. We do have a vision for municipal government in this province, namely, as my colleague the member for Brant-Haldimand has mentioned, that we recognize that each municipality is unique. That is why I was with my honourable opposition critic from the Liberal Party in the Haldimand-Norfolk area to see if we could come up with some solutions of governance that apply to that area. I'm sure he would agree that the solutions that will come out of there will be quite different probably than the solutions proposed by the various studies in Ottawa-Carleton.

It's also a vision that in a democratic process you have to have some connection between representation and population. In Ottawa-Carleton, unlike any other region, you have municipalities that range in size from half a million people to some 1,200 people. To have one vote per one mayor for each of those is simply undemocratic. There's no other region that is quite like that, and therefore this is a unique solution to a unique set of circumstances, a unique solution stemming from a series of studies looking at that particular situation.

There is a vision. There's a vision that each region is different, that each part of the province is different, and I think the members will see that as we bring in our legislation based on the Sewell commission.

There's also a vision that municipalities have a role in economic development. That is why the board of trade and members of the board of trade in Ottawa-Carleton have been so supportive of this.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate on Bill 143?

**Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East):** I'm disappointed that the point of order from my honourable friend from Carleton was ruled out of order, for the simple reason that this very important bill we are about to discuss not only encompasses municipal government restructuring but is also affecting school boards in the Ottawa-Carleton area. Not being an expert in the education field, our party's critic for Education, the member for York North, will be addressing the education part of this bill.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** York-Mackenzie.

**Mr Grandmaître:** It's been changed to York-Mackenzie.

The minister talked about the vision of local government, not only in Ottawa-Carleton but right across this province. He was saying that we have 817 unique governments in Ontario, that everybody is unique. The people of Ottawa-Carleton were asking the ministry for a simple government, understandable by the taxpayers of Ottawa-Carleton, and what we are faced with today is a major omnibus bill amending the Education Act and also the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Act.

The minister talked about democracy. I would like to tell the minister that if we live in a real democracy in the province of Ontario, he will adhere to the point of order from the member for Carleton and split this bill in two.

I would ask that this very important bill be addressed by the Liberal Education critic and that he should be given 90 minutes to discuss the education part of this bill.

I would ask the consent of this House that the Liberal critic be given 90 minutes to address the education part of this bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is the honourable member making a formal request? Do we have unanimous consent that the Education critic be given 90 minutes? Agreed? No, we don't have unanimous consent.

**Mr Grandmaître:** The minister was the first one to say no, and he calls it democracy in the province of Ontario. With what the minister just did, he will force members of this House who agree with a number of sections of this bill pertaining to the municipal part of it, also the education part of it, to vote against Bill 143 as a whole. It's very unfair on your part, Minister, not to split the bill in two parts—very unfair.

If I can go back to last November and December, when the minister paid thousands and thousands of dollars to advertise in our local newspapers, blaming the opposition for stalling Bill 77, it's very unfair. It proves today, with Bill 143, that the government wasn't ready to move on Bill 77.

That's the stalling tactic they use: They blame the opposition. This is the first time in 10 years that I've seen a majority government blaming the opposition, a majority government that has the power to—and it used that power with Bill 100, and Bill 40, if I'm not mistaken: It put a time allocation. If the minister had been serious back in November or December, I'm sure he would have moved on it, because people in Ottawa-Carleton are as anxious as the minister is to have some changes at the regional level.

We are the only municipality, as it was pointed out by the minister, without a regional police force. I happen to believe we need a regional police force, but I will be forced to vote against it because he's removing the mayors. I'll be getting into the details of the different sections of the bill.

As pointed out by the minister, Ottawa-Carleton is unique. You've got to go back to 1968, when Ottawa-Carleton was created by the then Conservative government under the leadership of Darcy McKeough. We were unique, and he recognized that he couldn't put in place a regional police force, for a number of reasons.

At that time, we had 17 municipalities in Ottawa-Carleton, which was scaled down to 11 municipalities. Some 75% of our population was receiving police services from the OPP—mind you, free of charge. That's one of the reasons regional police weren't instituted back in 1969.

In the Ottawa-Carleton regional act, there was a little clause that said, "This government has to be reviewed after five years," so in 1975, Dr Henry Mayo was asked to conduct an evaluation of the services in Ottawa-Carleton. Dr Mayo came out with 27 different recommendations. Not one of those recommendations was ever implemented. I shouldn't say ever implemented; some of them are in Bill 143 and also in the former Bill 178.

1600

Back in 1987, we decided, a new government, that we should have another study, because our 11 municipalities

were on side that regional government in the Ottawa-Carleton area needed to be revamped. We went on with David Bartlett, and David Bartlett did a reasonably good job, I would say a good job. In 1990, to complete the David Bartlett report, Katherine Graham looked at the possibility of creating regional wards, which was a good report.

The intention of the government in 1989 was to put these two reports together and have people from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and local people from Ottawa-Carleton look at them and come up with a reasonable approach. I think it would have been much more appreciated and successful if the results of the Bartlett and the Graham report, not the Kirby report but the Katherine Graham report, had been put together to reach a consensus.

But while we were talking about Bill 32, the bill that permitted the regional chair to be elected at large in Ottawa-Carleton, a rat came out, and that was one-tier government. There was only one municipality in Ottawa-Carleton interested in one-tier government, and that was the city of Ottawa, which I represent part of. I represent three mayors in this bill, and those three mayors don't see eye to eye, so it's very difficult for me to stand and say, "I'm in favour of this for Nepean or Kanata or Ottawa or Vanier." I look at my region globally and I want to try to be as reasonable as possible.

But when Kirby, a well-respected citizen of Ottawa-Carleton, was appointed, his mandate was to look at one-tier government, and we spent \$500,000 to say no to one-tier government. I think we've spent close to \$2 million in the last 18 or 20 years in Ottawa-Carleton to look at reviews, and very few things were completed or accomplished.

Talking about democracy and talking about the great support for this bill, as pointed out by the minister in his opening remarks—he was talking about the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade with great respect. Naturally they want economic development in Ottawa-Carleton, and I support this. I support that section of the bill. Ottawa-Carleton should have the responsibility for economic development. I support this, but at the same time I don't support other sections of the bill.

Let me talk about the taxpayers of Ottawa-Carleton, the real people, people who pay taxes every day for education, municipal services and regional services. Here's a letter from Citizens for Good Government. They talk about the democratic process:

"Mr Philip states that Bill 77"—it was Bill 77 in those days—"is based upon the Kirby report. The Kirby report does not recommend the restructuring of local government in Ottawa-Carleton at this time, nor does he even suggest that lower-tier representation be removed from regional council. Mr Philip's legislation is in conflict with the very report he commissioned."

The Coopers and Lybrand people conducted a poll for the Kirby commission and the results are very clear: Net satisfaction with local municipalities or local government, 76%; net satisfaction with regional government, 57%.

These are citizens, these are taxpayers. I could go on

and on and read from 1,800 letters from citizens, mostly opposed; 95% of them are opposed. A resolution from the city of Gloucester was circulated among our 817 municipalities and 68% of them wanted this bill withdrawn, and yet the minister talks about his support.

The minister and the government are missing out on a great thing in Ottawa-Carleton. He had a golden opportunity to create a very unique government in Ottawa-Carleton.

I'd like to go on with the response of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Review Commission, the Kirby report, from the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. There are 41 recommendations in the Kirby report, and at the very beginning, here's the executive summary:

"We believe that any reform initiatives within Ottawa-Carleton should only be implemented if the outcome results in a more accessible and accountable local government. The impact of any decisions should not require increased taxes to provide the same services." The recommendations from regional council are very, very clear.

With your permission, Mr Speaker, I would like to talk about these recommendations from the local area, from regional council. Let's take recommendation 1, which talks about one tier or two tiers. I pointed out to you that it was a waste of time. It was strongly agreed by the 11 municipalities that the two-tier system is working and working well, and please don't touch it: "The region strongly supports the present two-tier structure of government in Ottawa-Carleton as the most accountable form of municipal government."

The minister had an answer to his one-tier government before the study was ever started, but possibly with the pressure from the member for Ottawa Centre—one morning at a breakfast while I was talking to the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr Cooke, one-tier government surfaced: "Let's look at one-tier government." I was told while discussing Bill 32 by the then Minister of Municipal Affairs that no, one-tier government was out of the question. And yet, while debating Bill 32, his then parliamentary assistant, the member for Kitchener, who used to be the parliamentary assistant to Mr Cooke, said: "Look, there's no rush for this. Maybe we should be looking at one-tier government." The cat was out of the bag. We knew what the government's hidden agenda was, and accusing the opposition of stalling Bill 77 was a very poor excuse.

If I can go on with the main items of Bill 143, recommendation 11, the regional role of mayors and the number of regional and local councillors, is on page 16.

1610

Not wanting to miss the point, I'm going to read recommendation 11:

"It is recommended that the size of the new regional council should be set at 29 members, to include:

"(i) 18 councillors directly elected from regional wards; and

"(ii) 10 local area mayors (the village of Rockcliffe Park to be excluded);

"(iii) the regional chair."



I want to be honest with you, Mr Speaker. The question of excluding the mayors from regional council was never an issue with the Kirby commission. This was never discussed openly. This is why we want our day. We want the local people, the local taxpayers, to have at least three or four, maybe five, days in committee to address these issues. If people really choose to eliminate the mayors—and I don't know where the minister gets his information that the mayors should be removed—I think it's very important that we should have our day in court or in parliamentary committee so that we can discuss things.

Regional council agreed with the form of regional representation which sets the size of regional council at 30. As I pointed out, there would be 19 regional councillors, because now we do have 19 regional wards, with one regional ward to include the village of Rockcliffe Park, so as to ensure that residents can vote for their regional representatives and that the mayor of the village of Rockcliffe Park sit on regional council with full right to speak but no vote—10 local mayors, excluding the village of Rockcliffe Park.

Oddly enough, while all of these great negotiations, if I can call them that, as the minister refers to—I've spoken to Ottawa-Carleton municipal politicians and we came to no agreement. While they came to no agreement, they weren't introducing Bill 77, the real Bill 77, for second reading. How important was Bill 77 to this government? Let me read you a letter addressed to her worship Mayor Merle Nicholds from the city of Kanata:

"Dear Mayor Nicholds:

"This is in response to your letters, on behalf of yourself and nine other mayors in Ottawa-Carleton, of July 28, August 12, September 2, September 28 and September 30"—four months after. This minister and this government have the gall to say that the opposition are the culprits, that we were stalling the legislation. He couldn't even answer his letters; how could he debate Bill 77 in the House?

**Hon Mr Philip:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I simply referred to the matter that I was responding to each of the letters with the last letter as well, but all of the letters were answered.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. It's not a point of order.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Let's get to the bottom of this letter.

**Mr Grandmaître:** Absolutely.

I didn't say he didn't answer; I said he was four months late in answering his letters. That's what I said, and it's right there.

**Hon Mr Philip:** That's nonsense.

**Mr Grandmaître:** It's signed by you, Mr Minister.

**The Acting Speaker:** Please address the Chair. It would prevent a lot of consternation.

**Mr Grandmaître:** Anyway, that's how important Bill 77 was.

Also, the same minister addressed the House leaders, Mr Elston and the Conservative House leader, saying:

"Hey, let's do this thing, but keep your mouth shut. Don't say a word. Let's do it, and do it as fast as possible."

Going back to the mayors, I think the minister has received a number of letters from municipalities not only in the Ottawa-Carleton area but right across the province of Ontario. I will read just one brief comment from the city of Toronto asking the minister to withdraw Bill 77 for the simple reason that they were excluding the mayors. The minister received this letter. He also received another letter from AMO saying: "This is out of the question; you are destroying local government. It's very important that mayors have a major role to play."

I realize what the minister is trying to say. The mayors' representation will be replaced by regional councillors, and that's fair. But I'm telling you, what Ottawa-Carleton needs is a closer link with municipal taxpayers. After all, 55% of our tax bill in Ottawa-Carleton goes for education—and it's part of this master bill, omnibus bill—and 25% of our taxes go to regional government. So I think it's very important that our mayors should sit on regional council.

Where will the link be? Don't forget, these 19 regional councillors, these new wards, will cross municipal boundaries. I was looking at the recent map introduced by the ministry, and in my area my regional representative will be serving three mayors. How can a regional representative, a regional councillor, serve three mayors? How can he be aware of three different municipal budgets? I think it's very important that the person have the power to speak for these individual municipalities, but I find it very difficult that the role of the regional councillor—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Grandmaître:** Well, you'll have to sit on the fence because one municipality may not agree with another one. I think this is why it's so important that the mayors do sit on regional council.

I know that maybe the minister will tell me in his response, "Look, I've tried." But I say to the minister that I don't think the minister tried hard enough, because I had several meetings with these 10 mayors, along with my colleague from Carleton, and also my colleague from Don Mills, and I'm telling you, these people were open. They realized that something had to be done and they wanted to accommodate the ministry and the minister, but there was a rush. What was the rush? We've been sitting on our hands for the last three and half months. Bill 77 could have been in committee. It could have been in committee back in January, and I'm sure we could have reached some kind of a consensus.

As I pointed out, the regional wards will be crossing boundaries, and I will refer you to recommendation 13 of Mr Graeme Kirby's report and the result of recommendation 13: "It is recommended that the recommendations of the Report of the Ottawa-Carleton Electoral Boundaries Commission concerning ward boundaries and the contiguity of local and regional wards be implemented." "Agree, but with some qualifications." This is why I say that if the minister had been a little more persistent, maybe we could have reached a consensus.

Here's the regional government's response: "Agree, but with some qualifications. Cross-boundary wards should not be considered." The government is going ahead with cross-boundary. "Each municipality should determine its own internal regional ward boundaries based on representation and population." The minister did address the problem that he was faced with when it came to representation by population. He's absolutely right. When you look at the village of Rockcliffe Park, with a population of 1,800 people, as compared to the city of Ottawa, with 306,000 people, I agree with the minister that he had to find a solution. I think the village of Rockcliffe Park and other municipalities were willing to work out a deal with the minister to reach a consensus.

Minister, you failed. You didn't use the last three and a half months to really get in touch with these people, get closer to these people.

1620

No neighbourhood should be split in two within the same municipality. The village of Stittsville is divided right down Main Street. Imagine. This is unacceptable not only to the taxpayers of Stittsville, it's unacceptable to the regional government in Ottawa-Carleton, because we are making these changes and I think the government wants these changes because it wants to streamline government and also to save tax dollars for taxpayers in the Ottawa-Carleton area.

Here's a letter from the city of Ottawa: "The proposed regional reform for Ottawa-Carleton is flawed in so far as the political changes are concerned. There is merit in amalgamating certain functional elements such as police, waste management etc; however, the following points regarding politicians have not been highlighted." That's the costs.

"Projected costs will be \$1.8 million to employ 18 full-time councillors with office budgets." I don't know if you're aware of the cost that the regional municipality will have to expend to accommodate the 18 regional councillors. I'm sure that these regional councillors will be receiving an adequate salary. At the present time, as pointed out, as the city of Ottawa councillors are full-time, will we have full-time or part-time regional councillors in Ottawa-Carleton? I can't say because it hasn't been resolved yet.

"At the city of Ottawa, councillors are full-time. The remuneration, which includes regional duties, is \$57,000. Our office budgets are \$60,000 per councillor.

"At \$50,000 per full-time regional councillor plus \$50,000 for office budgets, the costs are \$1.8 million."

I want the minister to tell us that all of these changes, all of these possibly necessary changes in Ottawa-Carleton, will not be a burden on our taxpayers. This is why we need our local mayors to sit on regional council: to look after their municipal dollars. I think it's very important.

If I may continue with the response of Ottawa-Carleton, if I can go through my notes—regional development. As I pointed out, it is very, very important that we should have a sound economic development policy in Ottawa-Carleton.

Here's recommendation 17 of the Kirby report: "It is recommended that Bartlett's recommendation 2"—again, that's why I told you we didn't need Kirby, now they're using Bartlett; they're saying Bartlett was right; we're simply repeating, and we're going to pay you \$500,000 to repeat what Bartlett has said—"be accepted when amended to read: 'That the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton be given primary responsibility for the development and implementation of a comprehensive economic development strategy for the region.'"

When this recommendation came before council it was then decided, and I have a copy from the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, "Regional council approved that the Honourable Ed Philip, Minister of Municipal Affairs, be requested to amend Bill 77"—then—"to permit both the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and the area municipalities to assemble to develop lands for industrial, commercial and institutional purposes."

Also, to back the Ottawa-Carleton resolution, the Ottawa-Carleton Economic Development Corp did the very same thing.

"Be it therefore resolved that OCEDCO hereby requests the Minister of Municipal Affairs to amend Bill 77 to permit both regional and local municipalities to purchase, develop and sell lands for municipal, industrial and business park development; and

"Be it further resolved that this request be forwarded to the regional municipality for support."

This was done, and I just read you the result of that resolution when it was passed at regional council.

If I may deal with a regional chair, as you know, Mr Speaker, our regional chairperson is elected at large, and this was decided by council. I wasn't in total accord with the decision of council, but I have to live with it.

What the regional chairperson is saying in his press release of November 29, 1993, is:

"Although the regional chair believes that the government has shown flexibility on this issue, he supports the view that more public consultation is warranted regarding whether mayors should continue to be represented on council."

I think this is a very clear message that not everybody supports the elimination of the mayors in Ottawa-Carleton.

I could read you a number of letters from taxpayers, but I think it would be, well, not a waste of time, but I want to tell you, Mr Speaker, that we have received 1,800 letters, and I want to remind you that 68% of our municipalities that received the resolution of the city of Gloucester disapproved of Bill 77 at the time.

Again, let's talk about taxpayers, the real taxpayers, the Citizens for Fair Taxes, on policing:

"Serious concerns were voiced over the proposal for regional policing. While it is recognized that there are efficiencies to be derived from unified police services, it is also recognized that there are significant differences in policing requirements for urban and rural areas within the region. The cost of police services is not uniformly recovered from municipalities, particularly in rural townships."



Back in 1976, Mr Speaker, with your permission, I would like to talk to you about my private resolution at regional council. I wanted a regional police force in Ottawa-Carleton. As I put it out to you back in 1969, 75% of our population was serviced by free OPP policing. While this free OPP policing was accommodating seven of our 11 municipalities, my own small municipality of Vanier was paying \$2.3 million for policing, while the village of Rockcliffe Park, with 1,800 people, and part of Gloucester and Kanata were receiving free OPP. Can you imagine the city of Vanier subsidizing the village of Rockcliffe Park?

That's exactly the reason why, back in 1976, back in 1978, back in 1980, I failed, because the government at the time didn't want to correct this misuse of provincial tax dollars. At the time, I had met with the Solicitor General and the Attorney General, Roy McMurtry, and he had promised me that, "We will correct these inefficiencies," that everybody should be paying 100%, total cost, of policing.

Yet even today when you look at Ottawa-Carleton—maybe these municipalities won't agree with me, but it's the Kirby finding—currently, the four municipalities of Ottawa, Vanier, Nepean and Gloucester have municipal policing services provided by three police forces. Kanata and the village of Rockcliffe contract with the Ontario police services, and Cumberland as well will have a similar arrangement in 1993.

1630

But when you look at the rest of our municipalities in Ottawa-Carleton, West Carleton, Goulbourn, Rideau and Osgoode receive police services from the Ontario Provincial Police at no cost. With this new bill, Bill 143, putting in place a regional police force, imagine the additional cost to these four townships, and yet the minister was good enough in his opening remarks to say, "Well, I just got in touch with the regional chair in Ottawa-Carleton and I'm providing a grant of \$70,000." Today: This was a rushed bill. He got in touch with the regional chair today to tell him, "Yes, you'll be getting \$70,000 to put in place a communications system," and that's a rushed bill.

I'm sorry, but the minister failed, the ministry failed, to deliver the right message in Ottawa-Carleton. These four townships will be paying and paying dearly for a new police force. Back in 1976, the time was ripe because, as I said, 75% of our municipalities were receiving free OPP policing while other municipalities were paying dearly, back in 1975 and back in 1976, but today there are major costs.

I believe in a regional police force, Mr Speaker. I think a regional police force will bring us better services. I know you're going to hear differently from my own colleagues, especially from Nepean. They're going to say, "We have the best police services in all of Ontario," and I believe them, but we have to look at Ottawa-Carleton as a region, not only at Nepean, Kanata, Vanier or Rockcliffe. We have to look at the global picture and I think it's very, very important.

Also, a letter from the city of Gloucester, "It is our understanding that the office of the Solicitor General and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs have agreed to provide,

in writing"—that's underlined—"confirmation that provincial funds will be made available for the implementation cost of regional policing as well as phase-in grants for those areas which do not presently pay for policing."

This is dated November 1993 and this poor announcement of \$70,000 was made today. Where was this government for the last five or six months?

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** It's not been the government.

**Mr Grandmaitre:** Well, let's face it, I don't mind being accused if the minister is right or the government is right; I don't mind the minister accusing the opposition of stalling tactics. I wanted to debate and he knows this. We had a few private meetings and I told the minister to bring second reading of Bill 77. Mr Speaker, I want to repeat this: The government of that day, back in October and November, was not ready.

I'm talking about, as I pointed out, no tax increase. This is very important. People in Ottawa-Carleton want changes and were not guaranteed that it will not add cost to the taxpayers of Ottawa-Carleton. If you want to talk about the liabilities and assets, I know all of these liabilities and assets will be transferred. The police assets will be transferred to the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. But there are also pension funds involved. I don't have all the figures; I don't have all the facts. I just want the minister to listen to us and make sure that these financial problems are resolved before we get involved more deeply with the regional police.

A number of recommendations from Mr Kirby were not agreed to by regional council. Again, I think they were close; they disagreed but with qualification. I think the minister failed to meet with these people and resolve these problems.

What we have before us is a bill that will kill local government, not only in Ottawa-Carleton but in the province of Ontario. I'm a great believer in local government, in the local decision-making process. I think it's needed. We live in a democracy and the people of Ottawa-Carleton deserve to have the representation they need.

Again—I will repeat myself—I think that excluding the mayors from a regional council is a serious mistake. Imagine our other regional governments in the rest of the province of Ontario; for instance, Metro, Hamilton-Wentworth, Haldimand-Norfolk. All of these great areas are now questioning themselves, who's next? Because the ministry and the minister are saying that this is a model to be used elsewhere in the province of Ontario.

I thought the main responsibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs was to provide assistance to our municipalities. I see that now they have changed their responsibility, their mandate. We are now destroying the local tool of decision-making by refusing to let the mayors sit on regional council.

Bill 143 does not respond to the real needs of Ottawa-Carleton. I realize that the French-language school boards do need some changes. They can't simply carry on the way they are at the present time.

Comme j'ai mentionné tantôt, le projet de loi 143 ne répond pas aux besoins des gens d'Ottawa-Carleton. Si on

regarde le nouveau projet de loi, qui était le projet de loi 77 trois mois, quatre mois passés, ça devient le projet de loi 143, Loi modifiant certaines lois relatives à la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et la Loi sur l'éducation en ce qui a trait aux conseils scolaires de langue française. Et dans les commentaires du Ministre auparavant, le Ministre refusait que le projet de loi soit divisé en deux parties, soit la partie qui affecte le gouvernement local, le gouvernement régional, et la partie du projet de loi qui affecte le conseil scolaire de langue française. Le conseil de langue française, surtout le secteur public, comme vous le savez, est sous tutelle depuis tout près de trois ans. C'est la première fois dans l'histoire de l'Ontario qu'on voit un conseil scolaire, comme celui du secteur public dans Ottawa-Carleton, qui est sous une tutelle.

J'admets que ce conseil a des problèmes, j'admets que le secteur public a des problèmes ; ils ont un déficit ou une dette de 20 millions de dollars. Mais ma question c'est que accepter le projet de loi 143 tel que présenté ne change aucunement le financement du secteur public, ne fait aucun changement. Le conseil demeure en tutelle.

1640

Alors, le Ministre tantôt disait que c'était nécessaire de faire ces changements-là aujourd'hui par rapport au rapport de Brian Bourns et par rapport à l'élection de 1994. Pourtant, le Ministre était prêt à présenter le projet de loi. Il nous dit qu'il était prêt à présenter le projet de loi 77 au mois d'octobre, au mois de novembre. Si on avait passé la Loi 77, qu'est-ce qui serait survenu de ce projet de loi d'aujourd'hui ?

Alors, encore une fois, le gouvernement n'était pas prêt avec la Loi 77, et aujourd'hui, on nous présente un projet de loi. C'est un tour de bras qui nous force aujourd'hui, les gens de la région d'Ottawa-Carleton. Si vous me permettez d'adresser mes collègues d'Ottawa-Carleton — nous sommes sept — nous allons être forcés de voter contre un projet de loi dont peut-être 70 % ou 75 % des items sont bons. Ce sont de bons changements. Mais par contre, nous n'avons pas la permission de diviser ce projet de loi.

Alors, on parle de démocratie en Ontario. C'est très difficile d'accepter ce genre de démocratie. Je comprends que le Ministre a le droit ; c'est son droit de présenter un tel projet de loi. Mais ce n'est pas la première fois en Chambre, Monsieur le Président — je peux vous donner l'exemple du fameux projet de loi 120 qui apporte des modifications à sept différents projets de loi.

Aujourd'hui, on nous présente un projet de loi qui va changer la face du gouvernement local et du gouvernement régional dans Ottawa-Carleton. On ne nous permet pas, on ne nous donne pas le droit, de dire : «Monsieur le Ministre, on veut diviser ce projet de loi en deux parties.» Nous sommes sérieux. Nous voulons aller de l'avant. Mais, par contre, on n'a pas ce privilège-là.

Comme je l'ai mentionné, je crois que le gouvernement local dans notre province est le gouvernement le plus près du peuple — tout le monde le dit — et il faut donner à ce gouvernement-là les outils nécessaires.

Regardez les difficultés financières auxquelles nos 817 municipalités font face aujourd'hui. Je comprends le

péril du gouvernement. Je comprends que le gouvernement a des difficultés financières. Je crois que ce n'est pas le temps d'apporter de telles modifications dans Ottawa-Carleton, surtout au niveau municipal. On peut apporter des changements.

Mon collègue de York, le critique dans le domaine de l'éducation, M. Beer, et ma collègue d'Ottawa-Rideau, comme je l'ai mentionné, vont parler du projet de loi 143, c'est sûr. Mais par contre, ils vont adresser les modifications apportées à la Loi sur l'éducation, qui a trait aux conseils scolaires de langue française.

Alors, je crois que ce à quoi nous assistons aujourd'hui c'est la disparition du gouvernement local, non seulement dans Ottawa-Carleton mais à travers la province de l'Ontario.

On ne peut pas continuer de cette façon-ci. On ne peut pas continuer de cette façon. Laissez-moi vous dire que les dix ou les onze maires laissés de côté par ce projet de loi vont devenir l'opposition du gouvernement régional. C'est malheureux de le dire. Ils vont devenir la vraie opposition pour la simple raison qu'ils n'auront pas accès aux décisions du gouvernement régional, et ces décisions-là vont affecter les 11 municipalités. Ils n'auront pas un mot à dire. Ces gens-là seront représentés par un conseiller régional, mais je le répète : le conseiller régional ne peut pas porter trois chapeaux, ne peut pas, si vous voulez, défendre l'assiette fiscale de trois différentes municipalités. C'est impossible.

Chaque municipalité dans Ottawa-Carleton a des besoins uniques, spécifiques. Alors on place les nouveaux conseillers régionaux dans Ottawa-Carleton dans une situation quasiment impossible. Aujourd'hui, non seulement dans Ottawa-Carleton, mais à travers la province, si vous avez un problème d'égout, si vous avez un problème d'ordures, de déchets, un trou dans la rue ou quoi que ce soit, qui est-ce qu'on appelle ? Est-ce qu'on va appeler le conseiller régional qu'on ne connaît pas ? On va appeler l'hôtel de ville. On appelle l'hôtel de ville pour avoir des renseignements, et les gens d'Ottawa-Carleton n'auront pas droit à ce privilège-là. Ils vont vouloir appeler l'hôtel de ville, l'hôtel de ville va les référer au conseiller régional, le conseiller régional va les référer et ça ne finira plus. Pourtant, ce projet de loi veut simplifier le gouvernement régional dans Ottawa-Carleton.

Laissez-moi vous dire que je suis vraiment déçu de l'attitude — je ne blâme pas le ministre actuel. Je crois que le ministre actuel est en train de ramasser les pots cassés du passé, les pots cassés. Lorsqu'on a parlé d'un agenda caché lors de l'étude du projet de loi 32, on s'est fait dire que non, le gouvernement était ouvert, «Le gouvernement c'est un gouvernement démocratique et nous n'avons pas l'intention de causer aucune surprise à la municipalité d'Ottawa-Carleton.»

Le projet de loi 143 cause des surprises aujourd'hui. On ne s'attendait pas à un projet d'une telle envergure. Je crois que l'opposition, aussi bien les Conservateurs que les Libéraux, nous étions prêts, nous étions sincères que nous voulions discuter du projet de loi concernant le secteur municipal, comme le projet de loi 77 l'identifiait. Mais par contre, aujourd'hui on se voit menottés pour la simple raison qu'on parle d'oranges et on parle de



concombres. On parle de deux choses complètement différentes. On parle du gouvernement régional et on parle du système d'éducation dans Ottawa-Carleton. Il est très important de faire une distinction parce que, comme vous le savez, ça peut prendre un autre 10 ou 15 ans avant d'avoir une autre évaluation du système qu'on met en place aujourd'hui.

Si aujourd'hui on commet l'erreur d'accepter le projet de loi 143 tel que présenté, surtout dans le domaine des municipalités où la responsabilité du gouvernement local dans Ottawa-Carleton, nous faisons une erreur. Maintenant, mes collègues, les experts dans le domaine de l'éducation vont adresser le projet de loi 143 et vont nous démontrer que certains changements sont nécessaires mais, par contre, une meilleure consultation. Pourtant le gouvernement, qui se dit le plus grand, le plus près du peuple, «Nous avons été élus par le peuple, nous sommes des gens du peuple», aujourd'hui on s'éloigne de ce même peuple-là.

Je crois qu'il est très, très important que le gouvernement actuel revienne à ses principes de 1990 ou de 1988-89 et rende le gouvernement plus accessible, non seulement le gouvernement provincial mais le gouvernement municipal. Je le répète : ce que nous sommes en train d'accepter aujourd'hui, je serai forcé de voter contre un projet de loi d'une telle envergure si on ne modifie pas, si on ne change pas, si on ne sépare pas en trois, peut-être en quatre secteurs le projet de loi 143.

Je pourrais continuer. Par contre, je veux laisser la parole à d'autres collègues aujourd'hui, ceci étant la dernière journée de la semaine, jeudi, pour discuter d'un tel projet. Alors je remercie les gens de l'Assemblée de m'avoir écouté et j'espère que le gouvernement de l'Ontario va nous écouter, nous les gens d'Ottawa-Carleton qui avons besoin de l'appui du gouvernement de l'Ontario.

Madam Speaker, I will relegate my place to another colleague who would like to address Bill 143, another former municipal politician, who will be saying maybe not the same things I've said, but I'm sure will deliver a message to the government of Ontario that our local government tools cannot be exchanged for sticks.

1650

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** We now have an opportunity for questions or comments.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I want to congratulate my colleague. He has a very difficult task in front of him, because of course he represents several municipalities, some which support the bill, some which don't. I can understand why he says he's 75% en accord avec le projet de loi, because 75% of his constituents no doubt do too.

He enters into the debate with the issue of consultation: Was there enough consultation? Was there consultation with the changes from Bill 77 to the present legislation? Of course, as he mentions, the bulk of those changes has to do with the French-language board and with the educational boards as were established.

I should mention that on December 9 of last year, just a few months ago, my friend was at a meeting at the

Ministry of Education and Training which was hosted by his colleague the Education critic, Charles Beer, at which of course there was a full review of the information about the proposed changes for the Ottawa-Carleton area. That was a meeting hosted for Liberal members in the Ottawa-Carleton area which I believe he was present at—at least I was informed he was present—and I think that's some form of consultation.

Also, on January 25 of this year, in Ottawa, there was a full meeting with all the boards, the chairs, the trustees, the employee groups, to go over all the details in this new bill, these changes that were recommended. I would suggest that this was not only publicized, but was a full meeting at which there was great discussion, both with local representatives of the Ministry of Education and with the Ministry of Education representatives from here at Queen's Park.

So when we're talking about consultation, and we've talked about a process that's gone on for years, I think we've done it.

**Mr Eddy:** I just want to take a moment to congratulate the member for Ottawa East, my colleague, on bringing the concerns of his constituents, taxpayers and citizens of Ottawa-Carleton, because that's important. As a representative, he should be doing that, and he has done that very eloquently and impressed me with the reasons for their concerns.

With changes in municipal government, to be acceptable it must be proven that they're acceptable: They must be cost-effective. Maybe that's the case with some of these changes, that they'd be cost-effective, but I think the most important thing in local government is to have it approachable. The upper-tier governments provide municipal services on an area-wide basis. They're services that were carried out by local councils, and through mandate or direction or indeed, in many cases, approval by both the local councils and the upper tier, services have been transferred. There are many advantages, but they're acceptable when they're proven to be needed on an area-wide basis and cost-effective.

The representation is the key to the whole thing in my opinion. You must have liaison, as he has pointed out, between the two levels of local government, because it is local government. It's local government even though it is in two parts. It's essential, and that's the most important part of the thing.

I speak from having served on both lower-tier and upper-tier governments and having been associated with them for several decades. I've seen mistakes that have been made; I've seen changes that were forced on local governments many years ago.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. The member's time has expired.

**Mr David Johnson:** The point that's being made is that people want government that is effective, that is efficient, that is accountable and that is accessible. They're not dictating how this government structure should be, but they want a government put in place that has those kinds of qualifications.

The experience has been that if the service is provided

at the grass roots, at what's commonly referred to as the lowest level of government—I don't like that terminology of "the lowest" level of government. It generally describes the local municipal council, and that should be viewed as being the highest level of government in many instances, because that is the government that's closest to the people. That's where the service can be delivered most effectively, that's where there is the accountability, that's where there is the accessibility. That's where my vision of government is, by the way.

The member for Ottawa East is concerned that that level of government will be killed. I can tell you, through various polls I've seen on governments, that the most popular level of government is the local level of government. It's the most popular, viewed as being the most effective and the most efficient. The regional government is viewed to be the next most efficient and effective, provincial is the second-least effective level of government in the eyes of the people—

**Mr White:** Then why did you run provincially?

**Mr David Johnson:** To make it better is why I ran—and the federal government is viewed as being the least efficient level of government.

**Mr Callahan:** It hasn't gotten better, though.

**Mr David Johnson:** It's not better, you're right. Well, give me a chance to work on it.

That's what we should be headed for. We shouldn't be putting in place a bill that effectively, as the member for Ottawa East says, has the potential of killing a local level of government. That's what the concern is here.

**Hon Mr Philip:** The member talked about grass-roots democracy, and I can tell you that in the case of the Bourns commission, they consulted extensively for six months. They have a series of proposals that are supported by each and every one of the trustees elected to the French-language school boards. It seems to me that that's pretty grass-roots democracy.

The member talks about fairness. What is fair about the fact that people in his municipality of Vanier have been paying, for years and years, for policing which they have purchased from the city of Ottawa, while next door, Cumberland, a city that has twice the population, has been getting off scot-free without any kind of payment?

The Liberals like to have it all ways. They said they needed more consultation. Well, there have been years of consultation on this. When we wanted to introduce this bill before Christmas, the opposition said they'd filibuster other legislation if we called it. That's how they delayed. I would have loved to have had it before Christmas.

They also said, and the argument that made some persuasion on me was, "Give the municipalities an opportunity to come back with a proposal that will deal with the problem of representation by population." Well, they came back with a proposal that you'd need to have a computer available to watch every council meeting—13 different levels of votes, with fractions in that.

I say to the Liberal Party, if you don't like what we're doing, why don't you tell us what your alternatives are? The Liberals always like to criticize what this government or what any other government is doing, but they never

have an alternative. They studied this to death over and over again over the years, the previous government studied it. I happen to agree with Claude Bennett, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, who said: "Ed, get on with the job. Get the bill through. It's needed for business and for economic development and for streamlining in Ottawa-Carleton."

1700

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Ottawa East has two minutes to respond.

**Mr Grandmaitre:** The minister is looking for an alternative. In my remarks, I did point out to the minister that the Bartlett report and the Katherine Graham report were not perfect, but the only thing not this minister but the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr Cooke, had to do was put these two reports together and ask the 11 municipalities to sit down. We need not have wasted \$500,000 to find out if people in Ottawa-Carleton needed one-tier government, because you knew very well that Ottawa-Carleton didn't need one-tier government, that people didn't want it, but you went ahead and spent \$500,000 to find out nothing.

We did have an alternative. We wanted to combine the Katherine Graham report plus the Bartlett report. The Kirby report is saying today that the Bartlett report was correct, the Katherine Graham report was correct. They spent half a million dollars to copy what David Bartlett said back in 1987 and also Katherine Graham. They stalled. We put it together.

**Hon Mr Philip:** Why didn't you do it then?

**Mr Grandmaitre:** He's asking me why we didn't do it. What this minister is saying today is that we had the courage to put these two reforms together, but they never had the courage to pass Bill 77. They never had the courage to pass it because they had some kind of hidden agenda, and that's the type of government they are. You can't trust them, because the move they're making today will be different tomorrow. We want an honest government in Ottawa-Carleton, and that's not the way to do it.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired. Further debate?

**Mr Sterling:** I come to this debate feeling almost like the debate has finished, because this debate went on in the fall of 1993 across Ottawa-Carleton to a very large extent over Bill 77. That's not true about the French-language boards because that's a new incarnation which we heard about only on Tuesday, and which I think is very unfair of this government to load on to the 18,000 French-language parents who have their children attending those schools. That's very unfair.

Notwithstanding that, the minister in response to my friend the member for Ottawa East said, "We consulted." He talked about consulting over the Bartlett report and the Kirby report and—well, I guess the Bourns report and even back to 1976 and 1977 and the Mayo report.

The fact is that if he'd followed the Kirby report, we wouldn't be into this debate. He consulted, but he didn't follow the consultations or the results of those consultations. His own person who went out into the community said: "Put the mayors on regional council. They're a



valuable part of regional council." That's what Kirby said, that's what Bartlett said, that's what Mayo said. All of this debate, this so-called delay is because the minister and this government didn't follow its paid-for advice.

The minister says the people of Ottawa-Carleton want this reform. I undertook to have a poll done in September of this year in Ottawa-Carleton because, as you know, I represent only one part of Ottawa-Carleton; there are seven or eight MPPs who represent that area. I represent five of the 11 municipalities, however, in Ottawa-Carleton. The question was asked of the people, "Do you support the proposed reforms to regional government?" Seventy-one per cent said, "Yes, we support the proposed reforms to regional government." This is after Bill 77 was introduced. The minister might say, "Then of course the people were in favour of kicking the mayors off regional council." Well, we asked the other question too: "Are you in favour of having local mayors sit on regional councils?" Seventy-nine per cent, four out of five people from the region of Ottawa-Carleton, think their local mayors should sit on regional council.

The fact is that many of the people in Ottawa-Carleton do not consider this as their highest and most important issue. It is important to people who are involved in municipal government, it is important to people who are involved in regional government, but I find it amazing that while Kirby and Bartlett say, "Put the local mayors on regional council," and while four out of five people in Ottawa-Carleton—this includes my riding and all the other ridings in Ottawa-Carleton, because I did not think it was fair that I polled only my own riding. As the sole Progressive Conservative in Ottawa-Carleton, I think it's important on this issue that I not only represent my own constituents but all the constituents of Ottawa-Carleton. Four out of five are for the mayors on regional council.

I have heard with much amusement the minister's argument about representation by population. I want to draw to your attention the election returns from 1990 for our province. When we look into the election returns for our province, some of our members here are representing four times as many electors as others.

The Minister of Natural Resources, representing Algoma, had 20,400 electors in the last election. I had 59,000 electors in the last election, almost three times as many electors as the member for Algoma. You might also be interested to know that the Minister of Transportation, from Lake Nipigon, had 21,400 electors. The member for Markham, my friend from Markham, represents 80,000 electors or voters. There are four times as many people voting for the member for Markham as there are for the member for Lake Nipigon. The Treasurer has only 24,700 people on the voters list in Nickel Belt, his riding, whereas the member for York Centre has 101,000 electors, five times as many electors in that particular riding as the member for Nickel Belt.

**Hon Mr Philip:** That's not a fair comparison.

**Mr Sterling:** I hear the Minister of Municipal Affairs saying this isn't a fair comparison. How about the constituency of Parkdale in downtown Toronto? How many electors are there? There are 28,000 electors, 28,000 people on the voting list in the middle of Toronto,

whereas other ridings just on the outskirts of Toronto have as many as 100,000; as I mentioned, in York Centre, more than three times as many electors. Mississauga West is another very large riding.

This whole argument about rep by pop is a bunch of garbage. It has nothing to do with our electoral makeup here in the Legislature of Ontario. Some of us from some parts of the province represent two, three, four, five times as many constituents as other members of this particular Legislature.

The argument might be, and I think it's a good argument, that this Legislature has made up its mind that there are certain things or certain kinds of geography in this province which make it necessary to have fewer electors in some electoral districts, particularly in our north. The Lake Nipigon riding, for instance, I believe is almost as big as the rest of Ontario. I have no problem with saying, yes, we've got to make an exception for Lake Nipigon, and we have to make an exception for Algoma, because that's a large area as well, and we have to make an exception for Nickel Belt.

Well, I represent the exceptions in the Ottawa-Carleton area. And this minister, whose government will not bring forward redistribution for the next provincial election because it represents the ridings in general which are at the low end of the scale, and if we had redistribution there would be many, many ridings which the New Democratic Party now represents which would grow in number and therefore they would not be incumbent in a lot more of the ridings—they on the one hand say, "We don't want to speed up redistribution for the next provincial election," but, boy, we've got to have rep by pop in Ottawa-Carleton, pure and simple. Why? Why?

1710

I represent one of my municipalities, the township of West Carleton, that has about 14,000 to 15,000 people in it. It is one of the largest townships in the province of Ontario. That results from the fact that three townships—Fitzroy, Torbolton and Huntley—were put into one township in 1974. It's a huge area to cover. It's principally a rural area. But to talk to somebody in Fitzroy Harbour or Kinburn or Woodlawn, to say to them, "Look, you've got to go down to regional government to get your government," these people don't relate to Queen Street or to Lisgar Street in downtown Ottawa when they think about government. They think about their township hall at Kinburn—newly built, I might add, on the prospect that the township of West Carleton's government was going to continue into the future.

Their representative, the person they go to to talk about problems, is Roly Armitage, their mayor. They consider Roly, if I may call him that, as the person best suited to take care of their concerns. Mr Armitage is quite aware of what's happening with regard to the services that they are provided in their area, primarily transportation services, which are more of a concern in a rural community than other kinds of services. But if they have a problem, they go see Dr Armitage.

To suggest that a new regional representative who will be representing not only West Carleton but Goulbourn and Rideau is going to have the same knowledge as Dr

Armitage has because he sits in that town hall on a daily basis—I was talking to him today about a problem of a particular constituent of ours. To think that this regional representative is going to have the same knowledge as Dr Armitage or any successor to him might have is very, very naïve.

I believe we could have come to a reasonable consensus in terms of saying, look, the directly elected people, under Bill 143 now, formerly Bill 77, will have the majority of the power on regional council, but we could have gone into a weighted vote system.

After the minister came forward with a surprising suggestion in July that mayors were going to be kicked off council and he brought forward this proportional representation story, the mayors got together and commissioned a report to show how they could implement a proportional voting system. Proportional voting systems are not new to our country. The city of Vancouver has a sophisticated voting system. It is difficult at times to figure out exactly how the vote is going to turn out, because some members are empowered with a greater power than others in terms of voting. But, quite frankly, it doesn't matter until the vote count is taken.

I also am informed by the mayors who presented this to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs that the municipal officials could find no fault with rep by pop with regard to the report which the mayors put together and gave to this minister. In other words, they did their homework well. There was no argument as to rep by pop after they had put this together. Therefore, the whole rep-by-pop argument leaves me a little cold because I really think that what you could have done in this case is diminish or take the power of the local mayors down to a lower level, perhaps a quarter or 30% of the total votes on regional council, and leave the rest of the votes to the directly elected people, but allow the mayors to be there to have the proper input.

What I find passing strange about all of this is that in the fall of 1993, on October 19, 1993, a bill was introduced for the county of Hastings. I have a copy of the bill here in front of me. It's private member's Bill Pr52, and this was introduced by the member for Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings. This bill is interesting because the minister over here claimed that there was a problem with 14 levels of voting or whatever he was dreaming up. This bill has five levels of voting for county government in the county of Hastings.

With a little bit of imagination, I'm certain that the minister could have taken the 14 down to five levels of voting and had one heck of a lot more equity than we have in our voting system in this Legislature. You would not have the situation where there was a 5-to-1 ratio in terms of the power of some citizens in this province versus other citizens in this province in electing their provincial representative.

I want to say that I don't understand the minister's rationale when this minister accepted a weighted voting system as recently as November or December of last year because the officials gave the county of Hastings their blessing to this weighted voting system. In this system, for instance, in a municipality that has 4,000 electors or

less the reeve has one vote. If it's from 4,000 to 8,000, they have two votes. If it's 8,000 to 12,000, they have three votes. If it's 12,000 to 16,000, they have four. If they have more than 16,000, they have five votes.

That's a way of evening off the rep-by-pop argument and having the very valuable advice of the mayors, the local representatives, at the table so that the people who are making the decisions at the regional level will be aware of what's going on in Kinburn and what's going on in North Gower, what's going on in Ashton, all of these very rural communities, which quite frankly are probably not going to be visited too often by the regional representative who represents that area. They are small areas and they bring their concerns to the township hall of Goulbourn or Rideau or Osgoode. I find it quite strange that this is the case.

I want to talk too about proportional representation again, because this is such a key to the minister's argument in terms of kicking the mayors off regional council. If you read the *Globe and Mail* this morning, you could see. When we look at our own House of Commons, perhaps the most powerful parliamentary body, or viewed at least as the most powerful, the difference in terms of the number of people per riding varies widely. It varies from as low as 23,000 to as high as 97,000 in this country. That's because they made an exception for the Yukon. The Yukon's a big area and they need one representative for that even though that person doesn't represent 97,000 people. In the mix of things, it probably doesn't really matter that much in the Parliament because I think with the new redistribution there will be over 300 seats in the House of Commons.

1720

Quite frankly, is it going to really hurt that Dr Roly Armitage from West Carleton has one vote at regional council while all the directly elected people have five and the mayor of Ottawa has five? Why don't we do that? I don't understand the logic behind it, when our principal parliamentary bodies in this province and in this country are not pure rep by pop; they recognize the difference in the community.

That's another thing we've heard from the minister. The minister has talked about the fact that Ottawa-Carleton is unique.

**Mr Eddy:** Let's take the mayors off Durham regional council. Let's try the other regions and the counties.

**Mr Sterling:** Ottawa-Carleton is unique.

**Mr Eddy:** Let's do it in Niagara; take the mayors off of Niagara regional council.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Eddy:** That's what you're doing.

**Mr Sterling:** My friend in the Liberal opposition, the member for Brant-Haldimand, is getting upset, and I don't blame him, because Ottawa-Carleton is no more unique than any other area of this province. It's no more unique than the regional municipality of Peel. It's no more unique than the regional municipality of Halton. It's no more unique than the regional municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth or the regional municipality of Niagara.



What does all this mean? Does this mean we're going to kick local mayors off all regional councils in the future? I can assure you that's a consideration. Why wouldn't you do it? If you're going to be consistent, why should the people of Ottawa-Carleton suffer—or in the terms of the government, benefit—from this great, great step of kicking local mayors off regional council? Why should only Ottawa-Carleton benefit from this very, very important matter?

I don't know whether my friend the member for Ottawa East brought forward the fact that the Association of Municipalities of Ontario is deathly against this bill. They believe that this is the first step to the destruction of local government. That's the bottom line of Bill 143. That's what local municipal governments think about Bill 143.

**Mr Grandmaitre:** Some 68% of our municipalities.

**Mr Sterling:** Listen, some of my mayors have said to me, "Norm, I would rather have one-tier government across Ottawa-Carleton than Bill 143." They have said, "We would rather be amalgamated and do away with this rather than go through the charade of having people down on Lisgar Street, downtown Ottawa, trying to take care of a problem, and we're going to try to take care of a problem and you're basically eroding all of our powers in order to take care of those problems." That's the way they look at this bill. I think the government has made a tremendous error here.

One of the other very, very important factors in all this is, what is it going to mean to the taxpayer? Is Bill 143 going to result in a better deal for the taxpayer? That's the bottom line as far as I'm concerned. I don't care whether there are 11 governments in Ottawa-Carleton or 12 governments, as we will have with the regional government and the 11 municipal governments. I don't care whether there are 40 governments. I only want government which is the most efficient and delivers the best services for the people of Ottawa-Carleton and the people I represent, and that it's responsible to its people and accountable to its people.

We know what happens when you have an enhancement of the power of regional government. I don't know a lot about Metro Toronto government, but I do know this: It has been one horrendous, expensive experiment and a lot of people are questioning whether or not that experiment should be reversed. A lot of people are thinking about it at this time. Their administration budget has grown astronomically, and what have they done for their area?

I'm having second thoughts about regional government. I had great, great expectations about regional government in 1970, 1971 and 1972 when it first came in. I thought: "Great. We're going to have planning on an overall regional basis. They're going to make decisions which are good for all the people. I can look forward in 20 or 25 years to ring roads going around Ottawa. I can look forward to the fact that they will reserve a great amount of public space along the Rideau River corridor for the public to use in the future." But none of that has happened. People are questioning regional government, metro government: Are they getting their money's worth?

We are going to have so many levels of government in Ottawa-Carleton that it defies imagination. We have 11 local governments; we have the regional government; we're going to have six school boards; we have a national government; we have a provincial government. It goes on and on.

The people I represent would go for regional government as defined in Bill 143 if they could be assured that this was going to be a more efficient government, that in fact what was going to happen was that they would be saving money, that the taxpayers would be saving money and that they would get adequate service. There is no fiscal calculation as to what the mayor is putting forward in terms of this particular document. The minister, for instance, when we talk about all these issues, is not saying that it's going to cost less; in fact, some reports which were put together by the municipalities which oppose this particular move have said it's going to cost much more to have regional government in this character and form than it was previously.

I want to talk a little bit about another issue that is a key one for the area I represent, and that's policing. I think there's some attraction to having a regional police force. My friend from Ottawa East said that he was in favour of that and I can understand that because the city of Vanier, which he represents, along with other areas, is contracting with the city of Ottawa police force in order to provide policing in the city of Vanier, and it makes some sense to do that.

It's a big problem in terms of the area I represent, and the member for Carleton East who represents primarily, mostly the area in Cumberland. Those particular areas in Cumberland—the township of Osgoode, the township of Rideau, the township of West Carleton, the township of Goulbourn—are presently receiving OPP policing and they're not being charged through property taxes for that policing.

I think that quite frankly the day has come when people in each municipality, perhaps of a minimum size, should be paying at least some portion of their policing costs. I don't argue with that. But how do you explain to Jim Stewart, the mayor of the township of Rideau, Al Bouwers, the mayor of Osgoode, Dr Roly Armitage, the mayor of the township of West Carleton, and Paul Bradley, the mayor of the township of Goulbourn that they're getting singled out in this province as four townships which are now going to have to go to their property taxpayers to pay for policing when there are at least 40 others that are in the same population range as they are and they're getting off scot-free?

I don't know where the equity is in it. I believe, quite frankly, that if the government has decided to do this, it must be consistent in what it does. In other words, if they're going to implement pay-for-policing policy, then it should be done for every municipality greater than 10,000 or whatever and it should be done across this province, whether you're in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton or you're outside the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

I think it's extremely unfair for this government to come into those four townships which I mentioned and

say, "You are now going to have your property taxes raised by somewhere between \$125 and \$200 per household while we're going to let the rest of Ontario off the hook."

1730

I want to tell you too that this is a significant downloading from the provincial government on to the property taxpayer in the Ottawa-Carleton area through this move. It will be also significant that the township of Cumberland will have to start to pay for its policing. They have about 40,000 residents, and they probably should have been paying for it before this time. Notwithstanding that, it's going to be a new downloading.

Can you imagine the amount of download that might be? In those areas you're talking about a population of about 100,000 people in total. The rough ratio in terms of police officers to population is one per 1,000. That's 100 police officers. It's not hard to extrapolate that. Usually, a uniformed police officer ranges somewhere between \$80,000 and \$90,000 in the overall operation. That's a downloading of \$7 million to \$8 million in this bill. That's what it is. That's what we're talking about here. The provincial government is no longer going to have to pay. They're downloading that on to the property taxpayers in Ottawa-Carleton: \$7 million to \$8 million.

I've written to the minister. The minister has said in the past that he's going to provide some assistance. When he introduced Bill 77 he went down to Ottawa-Carleton and said, "I'm going to give regional government the power to put this into a staged property tax increase." Well, immediately something didn't add up for me. In Bill 143 he basically strips of power on regional council the areas which are going to be adding policing. He leaves them with very little power, probably four to five votes in total out of a total of 19 votes. He's stripping them of power and saying, "But we're going to give regional government the right to phase this in."

I've got to tell you, if I were representing some of the other areas and I had been paying for my policing over a long time, I'd have to say to myself pretty seriously, "Why should we be phasing this in when my own citizens have to pay the full price for policing?" That's going to take a pretty big heart on the part of regional council to come to that kind of conclusion. In fact, I suggest that maybe they won't come to that conclusion.

The minister then said, in November or December, that he would provide "some provincial transitional grants," and I have asked his staff what we can expect: Is that 10 years, is that 20 years, is that five years, is that one year of transitional funding in terms of going to the full cost of paying for this new regional police force which is going to be created on January 1, 1997? I haven't received an answer.

I want to know another cost too. They're going to put together the Gloucester police force, the Nepean police force and the Ottawa police force. I asked: "Are you going to help them in their setup costs? Is there going to be any one-time grant?" Will you say to the new regional police force of Ottawa-Carleton: "Here's \$5 million or \$6 million, because there are going to be some transitional costs. You're going to have to get some kind of quar-

ters"—there are going to be some one-time costs: they'll have to change the uniforms, have to do a number of things which are going to be fairly costly. I haven't got an answer on that. I don't know if we're going to get any money on that.

I represent the city of Kanata. The city of Kanata is about 40,000 people who presently are serviced by the Ontario Provincial Police. They pay for their policing and have done so for the last six or seven years. They're being policed on a ratio of one to 1,000, approximately. They're paying \$3.1 million for their present police contract. The estimates are that the city of Kanata taxpayers are going to be paying over \$5 million under this new scheme.

Number one is that the city of Kanata cannot get from this government, or the Solicitor General or the Minister of Municipal Affairs, figures on which they can base their calculations. They don't know what kind of impact it's going to have overall, but I don't think they're underestimating it at \$5 million.

One of the real problems is that in creating the regional police force, we're doing it the old way. We're saying, "We're going to create the board and you're going to put all these police forces together and everything's going to march off into the future." There are no constraints on what's going to happen here in terms of finances.

We know there are three unions involved, three collective agreements. You can be sure that they're going to go to the highest, the most benefits in all of those agreements.

We know the administration is probably not going to pare down. Do you think there are going to be any fewer police chiefs or any less bureaucracy? I doubt it.

Back in 1993, last year, the city of Gloucester and the city of Nepean commissioned the Honourable René Marin, a judge from the Ottawa area, to look at the various police forces in the Ottawa-Carleton area. As I mentioned, we have four kinds of police operating in Ottawa-Carleton: the Ottawa police, the Gloucester police, the Nepean police, and the OPP.

What Mr Marin was asked was, what is the most efficient police force we can have? What kind of combination of things will give to the people in Ottawa-Carleton the best police force, the most community-oriented police force and the most efficient? In other words, which will cost less?

When you go through his report, you find out why those MPPs representing the inner part of the city of Ottawa are saying, "Yes, we're for a regional police force." I understand why the member for Ottawa East would say that. In this report, which is based on fact in terms of what's happening there, we find that in the city of Ottawa the per capita cost for policing—in other words, for every citizen in Ottawa, all 350,000-odd people; I believe that's the correct population figure for Ottawa; I've lost my sheet with the populations on it—is \$168.47. The ratio of uniformed police officers to the population is 558 people per uniformed police officer.

When you go out to Nepean, however, you find that



it's only costing \$127 per resident in Nepean. So we've gone from \$168 in Ottawa to \$127 in Nepean. Their ratio of police officers per number of people is one to 810, so you can see that they don't need as many police out in the city of Nepean. In the city of Gloucester, it's not \$168 or \$127; it's \$118 per resident in terms of police costing in the city of Gloucester, and they have a ratio of one to every 763 residents.

1740

When you go out to Kanata where they're paying \$3.1 million—and I expect it to go to \$500 million; in fact, I expect it to go closer to \$600 million—you can understand because they have only one police officer for every 1,027 people, roughly half the number of police officers per population. When you go to the rest of the region, which includes the area covered by the OPP, in Cumberland, West Carleton, Osgoode, Rideau, Goulbourn, it's one per 1,041 people.

What you have in this is a very different set of needs. What we have in Bill 143 is a takeover in terms of control by the centre, by the city of Ottawa, and guess who's going to get stuck with all the new costs? It's the outlying areas. They're not using the same level of police as the centre part of Ottawa is. It's all going to go into one pot, and everybody's going to be assessed the same way across Ottawa-Carleton, regardless of the fact that the areas I represent are using roughly half the police that the areas in the city of Ottawa are using.

The other part which is of concern is the cost per capita of the policing. It's not only related to numbers but it's also related to the efficiency of the particular operations. I've been told by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that when they put these pieces together—and the first pieces are going to be the Gloucester police force, the Nepean police force and the Ottawa police force—what's going to happen is they're all going to be put into the same new regional police force.

I said, "Well, okay, you're going to pay them for their assets and deduct their liabilities, I assume," just as you would when, let's say, you were amalgamating three businesses together. You're providing a service. You put three businesses together. The three owners of the businesses say: "Okay, we're melding these all together. Those of us who are providing the bulk of the assets should get compensation for that, and if we bring along a liability, then that liability should be charged back to the area from whence it's coming."

The city of Nepean, quite frankly, finds itself in a terrible, terrible position because it has practised good government with its police force. They paid their bills. They've paid for sick leave which has not been taken yet. I understand that both the Gloucester police and the city of Ottawa police are going to bring to this new marriage unfunded sick leave, and they're going to bring that in to this new conglomerate, the regional government. They're going to say to the new regional government, "Oh, we're short." It's not only the city of Ottawa and the city of Gloucester that have to pay, but the other nine municipalities must come up to the table for the ineptitude of the city of Ottawa and the city of Gloucester in not covering their unfunded liability. I find that totally unfair.

I don't understand why government, when it's putting together, it's trying to encourage in some cases amalgamation, which does make sense in some regard, doesn't come up with a fair formula for doing this. If the city of Nepean has paid for its brand-new police building, why shouldn't it get a credit for that? I don't think it takes a rocket scientist to sit down, put down the liabilities, put down the assets and say, "Okay, let's reward those who have governed in the past prudently, and those who haven't governed in the past prudently should pay the piper."

I find the structure set up under this particular act in terms of dealing with the regional policing unfair. In terms of those people who are putting together their entities—the Nepean police force, the Gloucester police force and the Ottawa police force—I think it's unfair. I want to point out too that the Honourable Mr René Marin, who I might add is of very, very high regard in the Ottawa-Carleton area as a judge, came to the conclusion, after looking at the facts and looking at what was happening, that it would make more sense to pool some of the parts of the police forces but to keep them distinct from each other at this time.

Now, I don't know whether I agree with that part of it or not, but I tell you what I do disagree with: I do disagree with Bill 143 and the fact that this minister and this government are going to be so unfair to particularly the Nepean taxpayer, and also to the Gloucester taxpayer as I understand it as well, because I think there is some unfunded liability with regard to the pension plan that the Ottawa police have as well. No one seems to be able to get those figures or those liabilities straight. Nobody seems to be accumulating what those figures are. I find that strange too. I don't understand why all of this isn't put on this table so that people can discuss this in the open and come to a reasonable conclusion.

I think one of the other very, very important factors with regard to the police force is this. This is from a group, the Citizens for Good Government, and I tell you, they want to have some public hearings in Ottawa-Carleton. They're insisting on having hearings in Ottawa-Carleton and I have told them that I will do everything to see that's done. I do hope the minister has the sense to go with the committee to Ottawa-Carleton to hear at first hand what the response of the citizens in Ottawa-Carleton is to his bill, because I predict that he will hear unbelievable dissent from what he has presented to these people.

You know, one of the most troubling parts to the people in Kanata and the people I represent out in some of the other areas which are more sparsely populated is that they have such a good rapport with the Ontario Provincial Police at this time. I think that I would have five—no, it's not five; it's more like seven or eight—community police storefront operations. I have one in Richmond, I have one in Osgoode, I have a couple in the city of Kanata and I have one in Stittsville. This is where citizens go in and work with the police. They help the police answer the phone; they do a number of things. They're involved, and there is a very, very close tie with their community.

I will give the OPP this: that they have been able to sit

down with the local councils and work with them as to how best they could provide, with the limited resources they have, adequate security for these rural areas. Also in the Kanata area there is a police services board that was set up some short four or five years ago to deal with policing in Kanata. The minister talked about Ottawa being unique. Well, Ottawa is unique, and one of the reasons Ottawa is unique is that there is a very wide greenbelt which exists around Ottawa; it sort of rings around Ottawa. That is thanks to the National Capital Commission back in the 1950s. I think it's great that they did it, because quite frankly the county government of that day or the provincial government of that day—I guess it was our government—didn't have any kind of foresight in terms of doing that. That hasn't been done, I don't believe, in any other municipality to the extent that it has been done in Ottawa-Carleton.

1750

Kanata sits on the outside of that greenbelt, so it is in effect a distinct community of its own. The policing needs of the city of Kanata are so remote from the city of Ottawa and the city of Gloucester and the city of Nepean that it's not even funny. That's a community of 40,000 people which is basically sitting out there on its own. To lump it in with the others and not allow the local citizens of the city of Kanata to have their say about the level of policing they will be required or will want to have there, the same access to the kind of consultation they have now, I don't know whether is an improvement or going the other way. I really don't know.

I believe that what the OPP have been able to do is to be able to work with each of the communities that they've been policing and provide a darn good service at a very efficient rate.

I don't have the same faith that this is going to happen with the regional police force, because it's driven by other political agendas. It's trying to represent a very densely populated area and a very sparsely populated area, and there are two very different kinds of policing needs in those two areas.

One of the things René Marin stated is one of the most important things in the principles of policing, and I quote from his report:

"To maintain at all times a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historical tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police, the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of the community welfare and existence.

"As the interests of the community welfare and safety become the primary concern, it should be easily recognized that regional policing is an organizational structure that in no way enhances the welfare and safety of our citizens. Regional policing can weaken community involvement, further distancing itself from its mandate of providing police services."

Then it criticizes Bill 77, which was a predecessor to Bill 143.

I just don't think that we have the structure in place at

this time and that this bill puts the pieces together to provide an efficient police force in Ottawa-Carleton. As I said before, I can understand the desire of the inner-city members in wanting this done, because my residents are going to pay for it. They're going to pay for it, and my residents, the people I represent, are going to have less control over how the policing is done. I am concerned that we will not have the same degree of cooperation between the police forces which exist now and the police forces that will exist in the future.

In our area, people still talk about police as "our police." The don't talk about "the police"; they talk about "our police." They respect the police out in our area and they still consider them as part of the community. I want that to continue.

Next, I want to talk a little bit about economic development. Under our present scheme of things in Ottawa-Carleton, each municipality can undertake its own economic development. The city of Kanata has bought for instance a piece of land and developed it for industrial use. They've been very successful in attracting a number of high-tech industries into that area. We've been very fortunate with firms like Mitel, Newbridge and a huge number of smaller ones.

The city of Nepean has done the same thing. They have created a number of industrial parks and made certain that when a prospective investor came to their community they could say: "You don't have to wait for six months or a year to go through a zoning change. You don't need to do that. We'll sell you a piece of land at a reasonable cost and you can start building tomorrow." The city of Gloucester's done the same, and the city of Cumberland and the township of Goulbourn. I mentioned Nepean. They've all done that.

Under this new bill, there's an attempt to give economic development to the regional municipality and take it out of the hands of the local municipalities. In effect, that's been done already, because we have an economic development commission or corporation—I forget what they exactly are called—for all of Ottawa-Carleton. All of the local municipalities have worked together and said, "We'll support this."

*Interjection.*

**Mr Sterling:** The Ottawa-Carleton Economic Development Corp? Thank you. They have worked together and put this together. There's already a body there.

I don't argue with the fact that maybe the region should be given this overall power to control economic development. But the bill doesn't allow them to say to the city of Nepean or the city of Kanata, "We don't mind if you set up an industrial park out in your area, as long as"—you know, they may put some conditions on that; for instance, "You all have to sell for a certain price," or, "Nobody can outbid another one." But why on earth do we say in a bill: "You can't do this. You can't delegate part of that particular duty or that obligation or that function to the local municipality"?

We're not so concerned with who owns the land; we're concerned with the principle of developing the whole area in some coordinated fashion. If that can be achieved and



allow flexibility, why not do it? Why not allow flexibility?

The minister is not cutting off existing industrial parks which do exist. They are grandfathered into this bill. But I can't for the life of me understand why you want to have somebody come to the city of Ottawa or the city of Kanata, into the mayor's office and say, "Look, I want to invest some money; I want to create some jobs in your community," and the mayor of the city of Kanata is going to say: "Sorry, I can't help you. I don't have anything to do with economic development. You're going to have to talk to the region."

The region's about 10 miles away, 12 miles away from the city of Kanata. That's not a long way to go, but doesn't this work contradictory to the whole idea of allowing the local mayor her due? Merle Nicholds, who is the mayor of the city of Kanata, has done more to try to convince this minister that he's going down the wrong track than anybody I know. Claudette Cain, the mayor of Gloucester, has been another leader in terms of dealing with that.

These are good people. The 12 mayors, I know, have their hearts all in the right place, and boy, when an investor comes through their door they want to get hold of that investor and say, "Come on, let's walk out and have a look at a piece of property that the city owns," or whatever. I don't understand why we can't delegate some

of this down to the municipal level and allow the regional municipality to do that, if it so wishes, at a regional government meeting.

I will adjourn the debate.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** Pursuant to standing order 55, I wish to indicate the business of the House for the coming week.

On Monday, March 28, we will continue our second reading consideration of Ottawa-Carleton, Bill 143.

On Tuesday, March 29, and Wednesday, March 30, we will consider the Finance minister's motion for interim supply.

On the morning of Thursday, March 31, during the time reserved for private members' public business, we will consider Bill 129 standing in the name of Mr Morrow and Bill 126 standing in the name of Mr Elston. On Thursday afternoon, we will consider a Liberal motion of non-confidence standing in the name of Mrs McLeod.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Thank you very much to the Minister of Labour. At this time, this House stands adjourned until next Monday at 1:30.

The House adjourned at 1801.

### ERRATA

| No. | Page     | Column | Line | Should read:  |
|-----|----------|--------|------|---|
| 101 | 5140     | 2      | 5    | but subject to the approval of the commissioner and to such |
|     | 5140     | 2      | 7    | tenant Governor in Council,"—this is the important part—    |
|     | 5140     | 2      | 9    | fire mutuals guarantee fund may invest in the fully paid    |
|     | 5140     | 2      | 17   | be deemed to be an affiliate of all of the fire mutuals     |
|     | Contents | 3      | 11   | <b>Act, 1994, Bill Pr99 Ms Akande</b>                       |











# CONTENTS

Thursday 24 March 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Brian Yam</b>                          |      |
| Mr Murphy                                 | 5151 |
| <b>Kimbermount Village</b>                |      |
| Mrs Marland                               | 5151 |
| <b>National Nutrition Month</b>           |      |
| Mrs Haslam                                | 5151 |
| <b>Transportation for the disabled</b>    |      |
| Mr Offer                                  | 5151 |
| <b>Seniors' dental care</b>               |      |
| Mr McLean                                 | 5152 |
| <b>Alternative fuels</b>                  |      |
| Mr Hope                                   | 5152 |
| <b>Transfer payments</b>                  |      |
| Mr Bradley                                | 5152 |
| <b>Workplace Health and Safety Agency</b> |      |
| Mrs Witmer                                | 5153 |
| <b>Hamilton-Wentworth project</b>         |      |
| Mr Abel                                   | 5153 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Ontario Hydro</b>                       |            |
| Mr Conway                                  | 5153       |
| Mr Wildman                                 | 5153       |
| <b>Transportation of waste</b>             |            |
| Mr Conway                                  | 5154       |
| Mr Wildman                                 | 5154, 5155 |
| Mr Sorbara                                 | 5155       |
| Mr Harris                                  | 5155       |
| <b>Loring deer yard</b>                    |            |
| Mr Harris                                  | 5155       |
| Ms Lankin                                  | 5156       |
| <b>Transfer payments to municipalities</b> |            |
| Mr Phillips                                | 5156       |
| Mr Philip                                  | 5157       |
| <b>Social assistance</b>                   |            |
| Mr Jackson                                 | 5157       |
| Mr Silipo                                  | 5157       |
| <b>Highway widening</b>                    |            |
| Mr Hansen                                  | 5158       |
| Mr Pouliot                                 | 5158       |
| <b>Haemodialysis</b>                       |            |
| Mrs Sullivan                               | 5158       |
| Mrs Grier                                  | 5158, 5159 |
| Mr Jim Wilson                              | 5159       |
| <b>Use of Edwardsburgh land</b>            |            |
| Mr Paul R. Johnson                         | 5160       |
| Mr Charlton                                | 5160       |

## Highway construction

|                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| Mr Daigeler                    | 5160 |
| Mr Pouliot                     | 5160 |
| <b>Student assistance</b>      |      |
| Mrs Cunningham                 | 5161 |
| Mr Cooke                       | 5161 |
| <b>Massey Centre for Women</b> |      |
| Mr Malkowski                   | 5161 |
| Ms Gigantes                    | 5162 |

## MOTIONS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Committee substitution</b>           |      |
| Mr Charlton                             | 5162 |
| Agreed to                               | 5162 |
| <b>Private members' public business</b> |      |
| Mr Charlton                             | 5162 |
| Agreed to                               | 5162 |

## PETITIONS

|                                    |      |
|------------------------------------|------|
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>          |      |
| Mr Mahoney                         | 5162 |
| Mrs Marland                        | 5163 |
| Mr Fletcher                        | 5163 |
| Mr Runciman                        | 5164 |
| Mr Cousens                         | 5165 |
| <b>Firearms safety</b>             |      |
| Mr Eddy                            | 5163 |
| Mrs Mathysen                       | 5165 |
| Mr McLean                          | 5165 |
| <b>Long-term care</b>              |      |
| Mrs Witmer                         | 5163 |
| <b>Workers' Compensation Board</b> |      |
| Mr O'Connor                        | 5163 |
| <b>Tuition fees</b>                |      |
| Mr Bradley                         | 5164 |
| <b>Retail sales tax</b>            |      |
| Mr Abel                            | 5164 |
| <b>Sale of land</b>                |      |
| Mr Curling                         | 5164 |
| <b>Haemodialysis</b>               |      |
| Mr Jim Wilson                      | 5164 |
| <b>Lap dancing</b>                 |      |
| Mr Hope                            | 5165 |

## FIRST READINGS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 145,</b> |      |
| <i>Mrs Marland</i>   |      |
| Mrs Marland  | 5165 |
| Agreed to  | 5165 |

## SECOND READINGS

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| <b>Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and French-language School Boards Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 143, Mr Philip</b> |                  |
| Mr Philip  | 5167, 5169, 5177 |
| Mr David Johnson   | 5169, 5176       |
| Mr Eddy  | 5169, 5176       |
| Mr Sterling  | 5169, 5177       |
| Mr Bisson  | 5169             |
| Mr Grandmaitre   | 5170, 5177       |
| Mr White   | 5176             |
| Debate adjourned   | 5184             |

## OTHER BUSINESS

|                                    |      |
|------------------------------------|------|
| <b>Attendance of ministers</b>     |      |
| Mr Ruprecht                        | 5162 |
| <b>Visitor</b>                     |      |
| Mr Villeneuve                      | 5162 |
| <b>Correction</b>                  |      |
| Mr Runciman                        | 5162 |
| <b>Ottawa-Carleton legislation</b> |      |
| Mr Sterling                        | 5166 |
| Mr Philip                          | 5167 |
| The Acting Speaker                 | 5167 |
| <b>Business of the House</b>       |      |
| Mr Mackenzie                       | 5184 |
| <b>Errata</b>                      | 5184 |

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 23 mars 1994

## PREMIÈRE LECTURE

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant la Loi sur la municipalité de la communauté urbaine de Toronto, projet de loi 145,</b> |      |
| <i>M<sup>me</sup> Marland</i>   | 5165 |
| Adoptée   | 5165 |

## DEUXIÈME LECTURE

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant des lois concernant la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et les conseils scolaires de langue française,</b> |      |
| projet de loi 143, <i>M. Philip</i>   | 5167 |
| M. Grandmaitre  | 5174 |
| Débat ajourné   | 5184 |

CA2011  
X1  
-D23

Government  
Publications



No. 103

N° 103

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 28 March 1994

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Lundi 28 mars 1994

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers



Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

*50th anniversary*

*1944–1994*

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 28 March 1994

## ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 28 mars 1994

The House met at 1332.

Prayers.

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### IRWIN HASKETT

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** I want to draw the House's attention to the death of a former member from my riding of Ottawa South. Irwin Haskett died last week at the age of 91 years, but his life was one that was filled with great accomplishments.

He was first elected to this House in 1959 under Premier Leslie Frost. He served until his retirement in 1971. He served in the cabinet of the Honourable John Robarts as the Minister of Reform Institutions for two years and the Minister of Transport for eight years. By all accounts, Mr Haskett served with great distinction in the cabinet and was held in high regard for his learned advice.

I can also inform this House that Mr Haskett was also deeply committed to his constituents. In addition to fulfilling his duties as the member of provincial Parliament for Ottawa South, Mr Haskett immersed himself in volunteer activities in Ottawa. To name but a few of his achievements, he was president of the Ottawa Board of Trade, president of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, president of the Ottawa Association for the Blind, president of the Eagle Fish and Game Club, and founder of the Woodland Camp for Boys. Mr Haskett also originated Ottawa's famous tulip festival, which every spring will act as a reminder for the people of Ottawa-Carleton of the man who so generously gave of himself to our community.

On behalf of all members of this House, I extend my condolences to Mr Haskett's family, and most especially to his wife Mary.

#### EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** Today I will be presenting a petition from citizens of my area who feel very strongly that the Employment Equity Act should be withdrawn. There are over 1,200 signatures on this petition: 1,200 people who want the government to know that they know the employment equity legislation is not based on fairness and equal opportunity, nor is it devoted to any discrimination in the workplace, but rather it means reverse discrimination.

There should be equal opportunity for everyone in this province. Fairness and equal opportunity in the workplace mean giving good candidates an equal chance of getting a job. It does not mean trading one type of discrimination for another type of discrimination and calling it equity.

Martin Luther King said he had a dream that one day people would be judged not by the colour of their skin, but by the content of their character. These people are

calling on the government to withdraw Bill 79 and let's get on with the dream of fulfilling Martin Luther King's dream.

#### PICKERING AIRPORT LAND

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** On the weekend, the federal government held a public meeting on the federal airport lands. I believe this was in response to the efforts of this government and the petitions that were presented here.

I welcome this initiative as it begins a process that can lead to a healing in this community of an injury that began 22 years ago with the expropriation of these lands by both the federal and provincial governments.

My government, this government, recognized that this healing needed to take place almost immediately with respect to the provincial land holdings. We moved swiftly when we took office to review these issues involved and acted quickly to put an end to much of the uncertainty on the provincial lands.

We went forward with the Rouge park, the Rouge-Duffin agricultural preserve and the Rouge-Duffin corridor. We worked with the community to develop a vision for these lands and moved as fast as we could to implement it.

We also recognized that there may be a need for some type of development, so the Ministry of Housing appointed an advisory committee to determine the feasibility of developing Seaton.

This advisory committee of nine is made up of many people from the community including a tenant who was an original owner. The focus of this committee is to conduct a broad consultation and make recommendations to the minister.

The process is all-encompassing and deals with many issues, from the ecosystem to the preservation of farm land and cultural heritage. They are also looking at economic and financial considerations as well as the social and cultural influences.

This is a mammoth undertaking, but it has many positive aspects. Most important is the opportunity for public involvement in the decision-making process, and we hope that the federal government will conduct a similar process with its lands in the north end of Pickering.

#### COMMUNITY WITNESS PROGRAM

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I'd like to take this opportunity to advise the House about a program that members in my community, my riding have commenced along with me called the community witness program, which is a program designed to allow community members to be involved in the justice process by providing evidence at the sentencing hearings of convicted drug dealers.



As you may know, Mr Speaker, drugs are a problem in a downtown urban environment like Toronto, and we are pulling together as a community to try and put a stop to that. We have the Seaton-Ontario-Berkeley Residents Association, the north Regent Park community organization, the police liaison committee, the Corktown Residents and Business Association and many associations in the downtown core in my part of the riding that are participating in this, and I'd like to recognize the cooperation we've received from 51 Division, Staff-Inspector Ed Hegney, the community relations worker there, Gerrard Jones, and the federal crown attorney, Simon Armstrong, who have participated in allowing community members to give this evidence.

We have volunteers prepared to give evidence in difficult situations numbering 20 to 30 at this point in time. We expect more and we're hoping that we will very soon have our first case where we will let the community give evidence and tell a judge what crime is doing to these downtown communities so that we can send a message to these dealers that it won't be acceptable to deal drugs in downtown Toronto.

#### HUNTING AND FISHING

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** As a result of meetings with over 400 members of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, it is urgent that I place its president's letter on the record today.

"Dear Mr Hampton:

"It is clear that you intentionally misled OFAH members on more than one occasion. You promised our people one thing and then turned around and did something completely different....

"When we filmed the Angler and Hunter television on January 20, you stated on camera that 'it's not in our mind to create a new series of parks which prohibits hunting, which prohibits the use of outboard motors...we see a continuum of new ways to protect those areas that will allow those activities to continue.'

"On February 25 at our annual meeting and wildlife conference in Windsor in front of approximately 300 people...you told OFAH members that you were not proposing 'to eliminate hunting or to eliminate the use of boats and motors' in the 'protected areas.'

"Then on March 9, you turned around and issued a public news release announcing your proposals for 17 new 'Keep It Wild' protected areas. And, you proposed to ban hunting, even small outboard motors and other motorized access, from over 90% of the 166,000 acres.

"So much for your personal assurances and public statements....

"Your record and your word have been seriously tarnished over this flip-flop. We are sure you will understand if our 70,000 members, our member clubs, our directors, and staff, are much less likely to accept what you say at face value in the future."

1340

#### IMMIGRANTS

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I rise today to voice my concerns over the recent speech made by the leader of the third party at Bobcaygeon, with his refer-

ence to immigrants who are coming to Canada for a free ride.

Canada is a nation of immigrants. Our traditions, our culture and our citizenship originated somewhere else.

Way back, Wilfrid Laurier's immigration campaign complained that Canada was being overtaken by "wasters and criminals, ne'er-do-wells and scalawags" when the European immigrants did not fit into Canada's imperial culture. Likewise, the Chinese Immigration Act of 1923 was drafted to block their settlement after the railways were completed. Likewise, Jews and blacks were denied entry under section 38 of the old Immigration Act, which allowed cabinet to refuse entry to immigrants belonging to any nationality or race deemed unsuitable.

I believe Mr Harris uses immigrants as convenient scapegoats for Canada's economic woes. This type of claim will always garner emotional support for any argument. It is a blatant insult to immigrants young and old, and it's a blatant insult to me as an immigrant, who have come to Canada to improve our lives.

The fact that Mr Harris chose to raise this issue during the recent Victoria-Haliburton by-election is all the more disturbing, and I say shame on Mr Harris and shame on the Conservatives for this blatant, blatant misuse.

#### GARDEN CITY KIWANIS HOCKEY LEAGUE NOVICE TOURNAMENT

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** The Kiwanis Club of the Garden City is celebrating a very special occasion this week when it marks the silver anniversary of the operation of its minor hockey league at the official opening of the 25th annual Garden City Kiwanis Hockey League novice tournament.

Hundreds of volunteers have given their time, effort and energy to providing for youngsters in St Catharines the opportunity to play hockey in a well-organized and superbly run fashion. Sportsmanship, honest effort and team spirit have dominated the philosophy of those who have operated the league for a quarter of a century.

To the members of the Kiwanis Club of the Garden City who raised the funds that allow girls and boys to participate in a healthy, constructive activity, to the coaches, managers, trainers, timekeepers, convenors and officials, to the parents who support the league and their children, I extend on behalf of the citizens of St Catharines the sincere appreciation of the people of our community, and in particular those who have benefited directly from this dedicated service.

What is particularly to be envied by others and to be commended by all concerned with the development of good young citizens is the motto of the Garden City Kiwanis Hockey League, which reads, "The name of the game is fun."

#### COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** Members of community college representatives across Ontario are concerned that their long-established role in recommending for appointment board members who best reflect the local community is being usurped by the Ontario Council of Regents.

The chairperson of Fanshawe College's board stated:

"This is a major change away from local autonomy and towards a more centralized system. The community should be very concerned."

A well-researched paper on governance in Ontario's college system by Abram Konrad from the University of Alberta describes how our colleges have flourished since their beginnings in 1965. He defines the difference between a community model and a constituency model of governance:

"In a community model of governance, the individual profiles of board members merge to become a collective profile which includes experiences and expertise that equip the board to function at its greatest level of effectiveness."

"The constituency model maximizes the political nature of board governance where, in its extreme, each board member is perceived as a representative of a power bloc with a vested interest. A board member with a special interest at heart rather than the college interest is likely to do permanent damage to the institution."

In light of the Council of Regents' move to centralize control of community colleges at the expense of local autonomy, we are convinced that the council is more interested in the political correctness of board appointments than in having committed members with experience and expertise.

We urge the minister to take the advice of community college board members, as they worked hard to reflect their diverse communities in their recommendations for board appointments. I would recommend that the minister and the Council of Regents study Abram Konrad's research paper.

#### JOB CREATION

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** Job creation remains our government's priority, and I'm pleased today to tell the members of this House that our government is doing just that in my riding of Oxford through Jobs Ontario.

Two weeks ago, I joined with Frances Lankin, Minister of Economic Development and Trade, to announce that the city of Woodstock would receive a \$3-million grant from Jobs Ontario Community Action. The grant will be used to construct a new double-pad arena, a 300-seat hall and a 15,000-square-foot gymnastic centre as part of the Woodstock District Community Complex.

The project will create 250 construction jobs as well as five full-time and 12 part-time jobs. In addition to job creation, events such as tournaments and trade shows will generate important income for local businesses. This phase of the \$12.5-million project will combine the new facilities with Fanshawe College's campus, soccer and baseball fields, recreation areas and day care centre.

Once complete, the complex will serve as an anchor of the community, with educational, recreational and social services. As deputy mayor Phil Poole said after the announcement, "This is the best news the city has had in 25 years."

The Woodstock District Community Complex is a prime example of the way the Ontario government can work in partnership with municipal governments and

residents to help communities take control of their own economic future. More than 3,000 volunteers donated their time and effort, with fund-raising already generating more than \$1.5 million. Along with the grant for the renovation of the Southside Pool, this new \$3-million grant will ensure that strong recreational facilities will continue to make Woodstock a great place for people to live and work.

#### STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

##### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AIDE SOCIALE

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I rise today to tell members of this House about our plans to step up the fight against welfare fraud.

Our welfare system is one of the best in the world. It is designed to provide help for people in need. We have been working for some time to make sure that only the people who are eligible for social assistance benefits receive them. But there is a group of people who take advantage of a caring system. We are going to pursue these abusers of the system more vigorously.

In 1992, we hired an additional 450 staff to help monitor the system and reduce the number of people who are claiming benefits that they don't deserve.

In December of last year, we announced a new computer system to better manage our social assistance programs. We are already working with municipalities and providing them with funding to help crack down on fraud. As members know, about half of all welfare recipients in Ontario have their cases administered by local municipalities.

Aujourd'hui, j'annonce la prochaine étape de notre plan destiné à prévenir les abus dans le système d'aide sociale. Les mesures que nous allons prendre sont raisonnables et pleines de bon sens, et je peux vous garantir qu'elles seront efficaces. Nous avons depuis toujours enquêté sur les cas suspects. À partir de maintenant, nous commencerons à réexaminer chacun des cas d'aide sociale administré par la province de l'Ontario et les municipalités.

Today, I am announcing the next step in our plan to prevent abuse in our welfare system. It's a commonsense approach, a reasonable approach, and I assure you it will be an effective approach.

We have always investigated suspicious cases. Now we will begin to re-examine every welfare case handled by the province of Ontario and by municipalities.

My ministry will hire 270 new and specially trained staff to conduct our investigation. We are also providing \$10 million this year and \$10 million next year to help municipalities fight welfare fraud. They will look at every file and make sure that all the information is available and correct.

If information is wrong or missing, clients will be required to come in and provide the necessary proof. We will make sure that every client has declared all their income, just as the law requires.

We will make sure that costs such as accommodation costs are reported accurately. If clients don't live up to



those requirements, if they can't provide the evidence, their benefits will be reduced or eliminated.

We will start with the most suspicious cases. Each of these high-risk cases will be examined within the next six months. Our staff will work with their counterparts in municipalities, other provinces, the federal government and the police as necessary to make sure that cheaters aren't claiming social assistance benefits from any other jurisdiction, and where we find evidence of fraud, we will not hesitate to lay charges.

1350

Je tiens à souligner que ces mesures auront très peu de répercussions sur les personnes qui ont fourni les bons documents et satisfont aux critères pour recevoir de l'aide sociale. Ces personnes continueront de recevoir sans interruption les prestations auxquelles elles ont droit.

I want to tell you that these measures will have very little impact on people who have filed the right documents and who meet the requirements for social assistance. They will continue to receive the benefits to which they are entitled, without interruption.

Thousands of people have been forced on to our social assistance rolls. That has had a staggering impact on the system itself, especially during a period when government itself is working hard to manage with less.

In March 1990, about 660,000 people were living on social assistance. By last month that number had jumped to more than 1.3 million people.

During this difficult time we have struggled to keep up as best we can, to provide the service the people of Ontario expect and depend upon.

The job has been made even tougher, first by the Conservative government and now by the Liberal government in Ottawa. While eight provinces get 50 cents of every dollar they spend on social assistance from the federal government, Ontario gets just 28 cents.

The measures I am announcing today are among the toughest in Canada, but they are not unfair.

We expect to save more than \$60 million in 1994-95 and \$90 million in 1995-96 as a result of these investigations. We will save an additional \$49.1 million a year through changes to benefits paid to couples, changes to shelter allowances, basic utility benefits and boarder charges.

In addition, we expect significant savings from measures already in place.

Last April, my colleague the Minister of Finance announced a series of actions that, when combined with other measures my ministry has taken, will result in net savings of some \$328 million by the end of this fiscal year. That includes reductions we've already made through more efficient business practices.

Over many years, overpayments have accumulated and now represent approximately \$335 million. We have started to recover this money, and it is my intention to recover all overpayments that are legitimately owed to the province.

Just last week our government made clear that there will not be a cut in social assistance payments across the

board. We are not going to cut holes in the social safety net; we are making it more effective.

We are working to provide alternatives to social assistance through programs like Jobs Ontario Training and we are continuing to develop new measures in our ongoing program to reform and to make more effective Ontario's social assistance system.

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** Let me begin my response to the minister with a very clear indication that every person in this Legislature would agree that we need to deal with cases of welfare fraud. All of us who support the need to protect our social security system for those who need it agree that we must indeed make sure that the social assistance dollars are going to support those who truly need them and whose only alternative, unfortunately, is to depend on social assistance.

But that statement does not lead me naturally to a statement of pure congratulations to this minister for the announcement he has made today. There are far too many unanswered questions about the sheer mismanagement of this issue from day one on the part of this government, and there are still unanswered questions.

As the minister puts in place a last-minute response to a growing concern about welfare fraud, he doesn't indicate to us whether he has any idea of indeed how much fraud there might be in the welfare system and what that's costing the system. Even more importantly, this minister gives no indication that he understands why there might be welfare fraud, what might be causing the welfare fraud. How can you deal with fraud in a system if you have no idea what's causing it? How do you know where to begin to look?

Minister, I ask you: What are your new welfare police, your inspectors, going to start to look for? What is your estimate of fraud in the system? Is it 5%, 10%, 20%? Is it really cost-effective? Is it a good use of tax dollars to start to examine every single welfare case, every single record, in order to start to deal with those cases where there may in fact be fraud?

I question the approach the minister is taking. I also find it ironic that this government, three and a half years into its mandate, is beginning to deal with an issue which has become more and more of a concern, because this government in its very first year, with its ideological blinders on, moved to take away any of the kinds of controls and conditions that would ensure that welfare dollars were being given, in the first place, to those who needed it most.

As the minister shakes his head, I take him back to a time of a former minister under his government who said we wouldn't need to have home visits to make sure the welfare recipient was indeed in the living situation they claimed to be. I remind the minister that they decided that a young person of 16 years of age could leave home without a particular reason for leaving home, without having to make the case of the need for social assistance.

I do find it ironic that this government is now taking steps to deal with problems at an end of a process, to deal with the problem it in fact helped to create. But

perhaps what gives me the greatest sadness is that there is nothing in the minister's statement which speaks in any real way to real welfare reform, to getting people who are on social assistance back into the workplace. Surely we would all have agreed that the real goal of reform in social assistance, the real way of reducing the cost of social assistance, is to deal with the needs of people and the desire of people who are on social assistance and who would much rather be working to be able to get back into the workplace.

I say to this government and to this minister, as I have said in this House time and time again, that in order to have real social assistance reform, there must be jobs for people to go to, and unless this government really does understand what is needed for real job creation, for real economic recovery, it is going to be difficult to deal with the issue of real social assistance reform.

I find it ironical that once again—and maybe this is the version of the Rae automatic excuse response coming out again—in any statement this government makes, any statement of excuse about why it can't do what it would really like to do, it becomes the problem of the federal Liberals who have been in government for all of some six months now. The government really does have to stop blaming the federal government for all the problems it has helped to create and which in fact this government has no commonsense approach to resolving, as the minister tries to present this approach as being.

I ask you, after three and a half years of government under the New Democrats in the province of Ontario, is this all that's left of social assistance reform in Bob Rae's Ontario?

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** It's \$7 billion a year to feed the debt of this province. It's \$6 billion a year to support those on social assistance. There's not one attempt to tackle the deficit, and that's where we should be going: to get these people off social assistance.

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** I listened intently to the minister's comment, and I listened to the leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario. If I listened to her carefully, I heard what I've been hearing for the last three and a half years: They still have more questions than they have suggestions, and today on the announcement in terms of welfare fraud, it's no different for the Liberal Party of Ontario.

But we in the Conservative Party have been raising this issue with you and your government now for three and a half years. The evidence across Canada has been very clear, much like the need for you to respond to the social contract in the fashion you did—late. You are now responding to the issue of welfare fraud when provinces all across Canada have implemented strategic decisions to tighten up the rules to have more accountability in government and to ensure that those who are truly in need received it.

In fact, minister, I'd like to quote briefly from Rory Leishman, national affairs editor with the London Free Press, who suggested that the Ontario government is the principal author of the province's financial misfortunes in this regard.

He says: "Despite the warnings of the federal government, with Ontario already plunging into a recession, what did the Rae government do? In January 1991, it increased welfare benefits, already higher than any other province in Canada." It went on to suggest: "The sad results were predictable: a devastating increase in welfare dependency for the people of Ontario. The process was well under way with the Peterson Liberals when they raised real welfare benefits and made huge expansions by more than 25%, which helped boost the number of social assistance recipients to over 600,000." It went on to compliment the province of Quebec for having "meaningfully reduced the number of citizens who were seeking dependency on their social systems."

1400

Minister, I'm at least today going to thank you and your government for turning the corner, that you've at least today stopped expanding your social assistance eligibility rules and are at least acknowledging that there is welfare fraud in the system.

In fact, I want to tell you that even though it's three and a half years into your mandate, the Office of the Provincial Auditor, looking at 1991 statistics within your ministry, talked in terms of \$140 million to \$200 million of taxpayers' money that was deemed to have been given to recipients inappropriately and yet your government had no ability to recover any of those funds.

The auditor went on to tell you that less than 3% of all the moneys that the courts determine are defrauded of the Ontario taxpayers is what your government recovers. Today's announcement talks about a recognition of welfare fraud, but at no point are you suggesting a specific action plan to go out there and determine it other than to hire 270 officers who will then start examining files and making telephone calls.

During the press conference today your answers were very straight, but they were very simplistic with respect to how this is going to actually happen. In fact, you're going to be inspecting the car in a person's driveway and the mortgage on the house, but you're not going to be asking basic questions about the spouse in the house, some of the rules of which you, by your own admission in the press conference today, say are rather unclear and convoluted.

The truth is that most of the fraud cases that are going forward are on this unclear definition of what constitutes a relationship for a person on social assistance.

But your government, with your abolishing home visits, by your increasing access for 16- and 17-year-olds, by your causing direct deposit, not having a home address in order to collect welfare in this province, and putting people who have been on general welfare assistance for two consecutive years automatically into family benefits, these kinds of changes you've suggested have only expanded this system beyond the ability of taxpayers to support it.

To be more direct, we in the Progressive Conservative Party offered you an eight-point plan a year and a half ago. Today's announcement only addresses two of those eight suggestions to tighten up the system. We expect



from you some vision as well as ability to manage this system better.

We encourage you to look at the Quebec model to empower our municipalities and our bureaucrats to do a better job. This does not have to be intrusive, but rather supportive of the notion of protecting taxpayers' investment in the finest social assistance system in the world.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In order for this place to work, we have to have some control of what takes place in this chamber. I did not want to rise during the response time and use that time up, but during our party's response, which is five minutes—I'm sitting this close, and it was very difficult for me to hear—I counted eight individual—

*Interjections.*

**Mrs Marland:** See what I mean?

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** It continues to go on.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Tilson:** They're still nattering away over there.

**Mrs Marland:** You see what I mean. I did not count the number of individual conversations on this side of the House because it's more difficult for me to see, but I counted eight across the floor of the House, most of them involving the cabinet. When the cabinet makes an important statement, I think they also want to hear the response.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Mississauga South—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The honourable member raises a very good point. Indeed, there were a number of private conversations on both sides of the chamber at the time the honourable member for Burlington South was recognized to have an opportunity to reply to a minister's statement. Indeed, there were private conversations at the time the minister was attempting to make the statement.

It's important that when a time is allotted for statements and for replies, both sides of the House exercise a great deal of quiet to hear both the statements and responses. The honourable member's point is well taken, and all I can do is to ask for the cooperation of all members of this chamber to try and show a bit more courtesy to one another.

#### ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: As I understand, there is a joint news conference being held right now between the union and management of Ontario Hydro. I ask if it would be agreed with unanimous consent that we ask the minister to inform the House of what has taken place.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is there unanimous consent for the Minister of Environment and Energy to make a statement?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I will report to the House immediately upon being informed. I'm told there are developments taking place at the moment, but I have not been told exactly what's taking place. I'd be happy to make an announcement for the members as soon as I'm told the—

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** We want to know what's happening.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Well, obviously the member doesn't want to know what's happening.

**The Speaker:** Another point of order, the member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Stockwell:** Mr Speaker, I would make a point of order that we recess briefly so the minister could update—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** May I finish, Mr Speaker?

**The Speaker:** No. Would the member take his seat, please. The minister indicated that if there was something to report, he would ask the House for its unanimous approval to make a statement.

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** On Monday of last week, the member for Nepean (Mr Daigeler) rose in the House on a question of privilege concerning an advertisement that had appeared in certain newspapers in the Ottawa-Carleton area.

The advertisement, which takes the form of an open letter from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, makes certain remarks about Bill 77, remarks which can be interpreted as suggesting that the bill would become law by a specified time even though the bill had only received first reading. The minister says, "The bill will be law well in advance of the official closing date for nominations of October 14, 1994."

I have reviewed the advertisement as it appears in the February 8, 1994, issue of the Ottawa Citizen in light of the parliamentary authorities. I find that the precedent that is closest for the case before me is a 1989 Ottawa ruling concerning government advertising that tended to suggest that certain fiscal measures, which had yet to be passed by the House, would become law. In the course of ruling that there was no case for breach of privilege or for contempt, Speaker Fraser of the House of Commons found that the advertisements were essentially informational in nature and that there was no intention to infringe the privileges of the House. Members will find this important ruling at pages 4,457 to 4,461 of the House of Commons Hansard for October 10, 1989.

To this I will add that in the course of the 34th Parliament, a member of our own House had alleged that disrespect had been shown to the chamber by reason of public servants acting in a way that disregarded the legislative process on a bill. In the course of finding that a prima facie case had not been made out, Speaker Edighoffer made the following remarks at page 273 of the Journals for December 20, 1989:

"I must come to the conclusion that what we are

dealing with here is an administrative error and not a contempt for this chamber. It is perfectly valid for the public service to proceed with plans based on a bill that is already in the system in order to be able to act swiftly, once that bill becomes law."

Finally, only last year the member for St George-St David, Mr Murphy, raised a question of privilege alleging that the government was acting as if Bill 38, which had only been given first reading at that time, had already received royal assent. The Speaker ruled that a *prima facie* case of privilege had not been made out in that instance.

In view of these rulings, and after careful consideration of the present circumstances, I find that a *prima facie* case has not been made out.

However, I want to say to the minister that this action has come very close to contempt, and in the future the minister should exercise more caution and exhibit greater respect for the proprieties of this House.

I thank the member for Nepean for bringing this matter to my attention.

On a point of order, the member for Nepean and then the member for Parry Sound.

1410

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I appreciate the ruling that you've just given and the time you have taken to analyse the point. I also appreciate the warning that you have issued to the minister and I fully expect the minister, as requested from me, will issue a public apology.

ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** On the point made by the—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. The member for Parry Sound has the floor.

**Mr Eves:** On the point made by the member for Etobicoke West, I believe the member asked for unanimous consent that the House recess for 10 minutes until the Minister of Environment and Energy is apprised as to what the developments with Ontario Hydro are.

As many members, and I'm sure the public, are aware, there are questions that every member of the Ontario public has, and rightfully so, I think, with respect to this thing. I didn't hear you ask whether or not unanimous consent in fact would be in order.

**The Speaker:** The member for Parry Sound raises a valid point of order. Indeed, I will ask if there is unanimous consent for this House to recess for 10 minutes. Agreed? I heard at least one negative voice. The government House leader.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Mr Speaker, before you called for the unanimous consent I was going to rise on the point that the House leader for the third party raised.

If we in fact with some certainty knew that there was something to announce that might well be a part of today's question period, you might consider that option, but we do have a legislative schedule to proceed with and

we don't know the moment at which we might be able to make any announcements. As the members across the way know full well, the clock is a rather important factor to any government in its decisions around the timing of the events that happen here in this House.

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** Very briefly, I think it's fair to say that, as far as the province of Ontario is concerned today, there really is only one overriding question, and that is the situation at Ontario Hydro.

I understand what the minister responsible for Hydro and others have said. I just assume then that we have an agreement, given the urgency of this question, that the moment the government knows something, particularly in terms of a settlement, there will be an agreement on all sides to revert to statements and the minister will advise the House. That's what I understand we have agreed to.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** With respect, Mr Speaker, I said clearly to the House that there are developments taking place as we speak, and as soon as I can make a final statement, I will be happy to rise and ask for unanimous consent. I thought everyone understood that.

**The Speaker:** To the honourable member for Renfrew North, indeed there would appear to be a general consensus that if there is something to be announced, there would be a request. The request requires unanimous consent in order for the minister to make a statement. We will deal with the matter at that time, whenever that should occur.

It is now time for oral questions and the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question will be to the Minister of Environment and Energy, and I suggest in posing this question that we would have been much happier if the minister had been prepared to at least take the opportunity we were trying to create to give the public some first word of assurance that this government is going to do whatever is necessary to keep the lights on in this province.

This minister, this Premier and this government have given the public nothing but vague hopes that there will be a settlement and some vague threats about what they might do if in fact there is not a settlement at the table. The public deserves more than that.

I consider it absolutely irresponsible that this government is playing the kind of brinkmanship that it is on this most critical of issues and that it could justify letting the public concern build to this point, giving the public no answer whatsoever.

The minister receives notes; we can only hope that there will finally be some word from this government that will be reassuring to the public. We are now facing a strike deadline which should have required that the government start to shut its nuclear plants down. The hour is getting later and later even as we wait for the minister to tell us what recent note has been presented.

I ask the minister to tell the people of this province that indeed the lights are going to stay on.



**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** Yes.

**Mrs McLeod:** I cannot believe the flippancy with which the minister has responded to that question.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** You asked me if they would stay on and I said they will. You can't take yes for an answer.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. Would the leader take her seat, please.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** The Leader of the Opposition with her supplementary.

**Mrs McLeod:** We were all aware that at the past midnight it was intended to begin to shut down the nuclear plants of this province. We were well aware that this could begin to result in the loss of electricity. We also know or should know that this very possibility was causing enormous concern for businesses, for major power users, for people in their homes, for people in hospitals. It really is irresponsible that when I asked the minister, this many hours after that deadline had passed, whether or not he can assure the public that the lights will stay on, he gives a flippant response.

We knew that when the government delayed the shutdown of the nuclear reactors at midnight they had to have some assurance that they were not going to permit a strike to take place in the province of Ontario. I ask the minister, and again I give him a serious opportunity, to tell us what guarantee he can now give us at this moment in time that there will not be a strike and the lights will stay on.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** That's a different question. I'm happy to report to the House that because considerable progress has been made subsequent to the Premier meeting with members of the union and the management of Ontario Hydro yesterday and because of the tremendous amount of work that has been done in the intervening hours, along with the assistance of the Ministry of Labour conciliation branch, significant progress has been made and, as a result of that, Ontario Hydro has postponed any orderly shutdown that it originally had planned for earlier today.

**Mrs McLeod:** The public needs some assurance as to what this government is going to do if there is not an agreement at the negotiating table. From the answer the minister has just provided, we have no guarantee that there is a settlement at hand at the negotiating table. We still have the hope of the settlement. I'm going to assume that if the minister has news of a settlement he would have shared that news not only with the members of this Legislature but in fact with the people of this province.

In the absence of any news of a settlement, recognizing the fact that with a strike deadline which is this Thursday and the fact that you had to begin shutting the nuclear plants down at the past midnight in order to do that in a safe and orderly way, you have recognized and Hydro has recognized that we cannot shut the nuclear plants down and keep the lights on.

My question to the minister is: Firstly, do you have an absolute guarantee that there will be a settlement at the table? Secondly, failing an absolute guarantee that there

will be a settlement at the table, tell us, tell the public, exactly what you are prepared to do in the event of a breakdown at the negotiating table.

Do you have back-to-work legislation ready? Are you prepared to bring in back-to-work legislation to make sure that there is no strike that would turn the lights out in the province of Ontario? Give us the assurance of what you're prepared to do today, Minister.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** We all recognize the seriousness of the situation, the importance of the electrical power system in this province for the economy of the province and for the health and safety of the people of this province. Both the management of Ontario Hydro and the members of the Power Workers' Union recognize their responsibilities, as does the government, in that regard.

I would hope the member would understand that if Ontario Hydro has decided to postpone the orderly shutdown of the nuclear plants that it had proposed should proceed today, this is an indication that significant progress has been made.

"Collective bargaining has worked very effectively. We have not had power disruptions to a large degree in Ontario. There has only been one strike in recent memory. I think that was in recognition that good collective bargaining is the good route to labour-management relationships."

What I just read is a quote from the then Minister of Energy, almost four years ago to the day, in the *Globe and Mail*, the member who sits opposite. She, at that time, was in support of collective bargaining to reach an agreement. It's unfortunate that for some reason now she's unwilling to let the parties work to come to an agreement and ensure lights will stay on in the province.

1420

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mrs McLeod:** Mr Speaker, may I rise on a point of privilege prior to placing my second question? I do believe that it is a point of personal privilege that in citing responses that have been given by previous ministers in the House, they be recited in their full context. Since I raise an issue and continue to raise an issue—

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Do you want me to read the whole thing? I'd be happy to read the whole thing.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs McLeod:** I want to make the point that while indeed we support collective bargaining, and continue to, and hope there will be a settlement at the table, as a former Minister of Energy, while I made those commitments and would continue to make those commitments, I was also prepared to tell the public exactly what contingency plans were being put in place. There was communication with the major power users and the local municipal utilities and there was some effort made to assure the public that the government would do what was necessary to keep the lights on.

Mr Speaker, I recognize that you may not acknowledge that's a point of privilege, but I will proceed to my second question.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** On a point of privilege, Mr

**Speaker:** I would just point out that in that same quote, since the member didn't want it quoted out of context, she said, "We have to deal with the reality that there could be power outages." That was in 1990.

**The Speaker:** Before every member decides to start quoting Hansard verbatim, the member does not have a point of privilege and I would ask the leader to place her second question, please.

**Mrs McLeod:** All we ask of this government is that it begin to deal with the realities. That's all we are asking.

#### FIRE SAFETY

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** I want to turn, in my second question, to another very serious issue and address my question to the Solicitor General.

Minister, as we all know too well, yesterday a woman and her son struggled to escape a basement fire. The woman died and her six-day-old is in critical condition. As we're also only too well aware, yesterday's tragedy was the second fatal basement apartment fire this year.

In response to the concerns that are being raised about the safety of basement apartments, the Housing minister has suggested that Bill 120, which is before the House, will prevent these kinds of tragedies by making basement apartments legal. I say to you today that Bill 120 does nothing to make basement apartments safe.

I ask you, as the minister response for fire safety, do you not agree that Bill 120 has no provisions that will ensure the safety of people who live in basement apartments? I ask you what you will do to prevent these kinds of tragedies from happening again.

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** The government, like all members of this House, takes tragedies like this very seriously, and we offer our condolences to all family members who are affected by these and similar tragedies.

Let me say very directly to the honourable member that the regulations that go hand in hand with Bill 120 will indeed address the major fire safety issues that arise as a result of tragedies such as we've seen today and others like them.

**Mrs McLeod:** It really is simply not a sufficient response for the government to say that at some point in time there will be regulations to deal with the issue of how basement apartments, which this government proposes to make legal, can in fact be made safe. I direct the minister to the fact that municipalities have expressed their concerns that Bill 120 gives them no control to make sure that basement apartments will meet safety standards.

It is a fact that during the committee discussions of Bill 120, our caucus placed an amendment that would require that basement apartments become registered. Under that amendment, as a condition of becoming registered, municipalities could ensure through inspections that local safety and fire requirements would be met.

We have also proposed, through amendment to the legislation itself, not through regulation, that apartment owners who did not register would face stiff fines so that

indeed this could be enforced.

Minister, I ask whether you will support our amendments to require safety inspections as a condition of registering basement apartments.

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** Let me answer this way: There was a committee that was put together under the leadership of the fire marshal of Ontario to review what type of regulations should accompany Bill 120, and as a result of participants, including fire chiefs and other experts across the province, there were a series of recommendations made. The government has adopted all of those recommendations and they will be enacted along with Bill 120, and the fire marshal is satisfied that this indeed will provide the kind of protection that he believes should be in place for the people of Ontario.

**Mrs McLeod:** I am well aware of recommendations that have been made and in fact endorsed by the association of municipalities, by the Ontario Association of Fire Chiefs and indeed by the Mississauga fire chief, Cyril Hare. But the proposals that had been agreed to, that fit with the amendments we have made to the legislation, are proposals which we believe would give real teeth to the need to inspect basement apartments. They include the proposal that Bill 120 should contain provisions to require owners of accessory apartments to register the properties with the municipality in which those properties are located.

It is my understanding that the response the minister has just given, that there has been agreement to incorporate recommendations of a report, does not commit to the registering of basement apartments and therefore would not allow for that inspection and that assurance that safety requirements are being met.

I will ask the minister very directly to clarify what he has said: It will be under regulations, or in fact what has been agreed to; whether or not he will commit and whether his government will commit to supporting the amendments which we have proposed directly to the legislation; and why his government has refused, and if it continues to refuse, to take the very simple step of ensuring that all basement apartments be registered so that we can ensure the safety of basement apartments.

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** The role of the fire marshal in my ministry and in this government is to provide the kind of expert advice governments need when they're dealing with fire protection and fire prevention in the public interest. We are not experts in that role, none of us in this House. That is why we have experts such as this.

The fire marshal's advice at this time is that the recommendations of his committee are quite sufficient to meet the needs of upholding Bill 120 and providing the type of fire protection that the public should have, and the government is responding and concurring with the recommendations of the Ontario fire marshal.

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** My question is to the Minister of Housing. Minister, you're responsible for housing in this province. You're also responsible for Bill 120. I have a very real concern on behalf of everyone in this House who has a responsibility in dealing with your legislation.



You have now been in possession for more than two weeks of the recommendations from the coroner's inquest from the first fire tragedy in Mississauga. We now, as you know, have had the second. Would you tell this House what actions you have taken to respond to those recommendations from the coroner's inquest?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** The member, as a member of the committee which has been reviewing Bill 120, has had access to the regulations which will be proclaimed under the fire code and also the changes that have been made to the building code to be enacted with Bill 120.

She will be aware that many of the recommendations that were made by the jury in the inquest are already addressed by the measures that have been proposed both within the fire code and within the building code, and those will meet most of the recommendations that have been suggested by the inquest jury.

1430

The one matter which remains is a matter which was raised by the leader of the official opposition in questioning of the Solicitor General, and that has to do with the registration process. The situation under Bill 120 is that all new apartments in houses will only be legal if they have a building permit and are thus certified by the building inspection branch that they meet the safety code, the Fire Marshals Act and the building code. Therefore, we think that registration will be unnecessary in these cases.

**Mrs Marland:** Minister, it's almost scary to listen to your answers, quite frankly. We have 100,000 existing units, at least, in this province. We already have a bylaw in Mississauga that requires smoke alarms to be installed in every home. The point that you're missing, and the point that you obviously haven't taken yet from the coroner's inquest recommendations, is that it doesn't matter how many laws you have; you cannot enforce them without the right of entry. What Fire Chief Cyril Hare told you, your staff and the committee was that without the right of entry, without a search warrant, he is powerless to enforce any laws that come as a result of Bill 120, your fire department or the city of Mississauga bylaws. What are you willing to do to make it a reality and save these tragedies?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** The member attributes to Fire Chief Hare things that he did not say in the committee. Can I read for your benefit, Mr Speaker, and members of the House, section 18 of the Fire Marshals Act, which says:

"Subject to the regulations, the fire marshal, deputy fire marshal, a district deputy fire marshal, an inspector or an assistant to the fire marshal may, upon the complaint of a person interested, or when he or she considers it necessary so to do, without such complaint, inspect all buildings and premises within his or her jurisdiction, and for the purpose may at all reasonable hours enter into and upon the buildings and premises for the purpose of examination, taking with him or her, if necessary, a constable or other police officer or the other assistants that he or she considers proper."

This section of the Fire Marshals Act gives full authority to the officials of the fire department to undertake the inspections they feel necessary.

**Mrs Marland:** You know, Minister, you are pathetic. I'm sorry, but you know what? It's very sad about what's happening in this House. We have two tragedies—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** For the honourable member, as I know her, that's surprising. I would ask the honourable member to rephrase her question.

**Mrs Marland:** I'm sorry, Mr Speaker. The answers are pathetic.

If we weren't standing in this House asking these questions today on the heels of two tragedies, two tragedies that my fire chief, Cyril Hare, warned would happen again, and unfortunately have happened again, if we weren't dealing with that fact, I could sit here and listen to the minister read something out which is actually not appropriate in respect to the question that I've asked.

Yes, as she says, upon receiving a complaint, they may investigate or they may inspect. But the part this minister doesn't read is the fact that the person whose property may, upon receiving a complaint, be inspected may also refuse. When the fire chief comes to this House and says to our committee, "This is what you need," he is not doing it because he's trying to make a partisan statement, Minister. He's doing it because he's trying to save lives. I wish you would do the same thing, and I wish you would listen to the fact that they cannot get a search warrant on request from a justice of the peace unless they have evidence, and they cannot enter without a search warrant.

**The Speaker:** Would the member complete her question, please.

**Mrs Marland:** Will you make the amendments that are necessary to facilitate the inspection and do what the chief says for the right of entry?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** There are two kinds of inspections which can happen in residential premises. One is property standards inspection, meeting matters under the code and under municipal bylaws—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** If you would just be quiet for a moment, I'll explain it for your benefit. Bill 120 provides new powers for a property standards inspector, on behalf of the municipality, to make sure that the building code is being met, and it provides access to a permit to inspect from a justice of the peace.

I think it is important for the member for Mississauga South not to confuse that question with the question of fire safety which, as I indicated by reading directly from the Fire Marshals Act, already provides that any authorized person can, within the fire officials group of the municipality, enter a premise in order to make sure, with or without a complaint. Where the authority, the fire office of the municipality, feels that there is a need to inspect, entry is authorized under the existing Fire Marshals Act. In truth, Hare never tried to suggest that was not the case.

## ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** My question is to the Minister of Environment and Energy. I heard your response earlier to the leader of the official opposition. You suggested that they're very close to a settlement.

I would like to take your mind back a couple of days in time to when the Premier announced his ultimatum about settling the dispute. I would ask you to fill this House in on exactly what that ultimatum is, what that ultimatum meant and when that ultimatum was supposed to take place.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** I think it's a matter of public record. As a matter of fact, I heard Mr Murphy, the president of the Power Workers' Union, explain what was said clearly in the media. That is that the Premier called both sides together and indicated that the government is in favour of collective bargaining and wishes that the two parties work diligently, with the help of the Ministry of Labour officials, to reach a voluntarily negotiated settlement by today.

In the words of Mr Murphy, as I recall, if that did not happen, then the government would take measures to ensure the integrity of the system and to protect the health and safety of the people of the province that might have ramifications that neither Hydro management nor the members of the union would prefer, and I think Mr Murphy's reaction was that they'd better get down to work.

I'm glad to say that both sides have worked diligently and appear very close to a deal as a result of the hours of work that have taken place since that meeting.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, I guess that's a new definition for the socialist party in this province of what negotiated settlements should be when the Premier then starts issuing ultimatums.

I will say to the minister, this doesn't sound like a negotiated settlement when the Premier says, "You've got to settle by 9 o'clock." It's now after 9 and that was the ultimatum: after 9 o'clock.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** He didn't say 9.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, then it's after noon. You people gave the time and you gave the date. As I understand it, that time was supposed to be 9 o'clock this morning, and if it's not, then you can correct that period of time, because I understand it was extended from 8 o'clock till 9 o'clock and now till noon.

1440

I ask you, as Minister of Energy, if there is not a negotiated settlement today, if they are still negotiating for who knows how long, when may we expect this ultimatum to kick in? When will the people of this province know, once and for all, that the lights will not go out, that there will be a settlement either agreed to by the two parties or the settlement that Bob Rae talks about of writing the contract himself and simply implementing it? When will we know, as the taxpayers in this province, when this settlement will take place and when this crisis will end?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The comments of the member remind me of the words of Sir Winston Churchill at Westminster when he said that another member was engaging in "terminological"—

**Mr Stockwell:** It's "inexactitude," Mr Minister.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The fact is, the Premier did not set a time. He said "by today," and I think the member should be very clear that progress has been made, that as late as only a few minutes ago I was in touch with Ministry of Labour officials who are involved in the talks. They were very, very optimistic and said that the two sides appeared to be very close to a deal.

I will be reporting to my policy and priorities committee colleagues of the cabinet this afternoon, and I would look forward to a deal being arrived at very soon. The Minister of Energy and the Premier are clear that we will do what is necessary to protect the health and safety of the residents of this province.

**Mr Stockwell:** You said he didn't give a time or a period when it must be settled other than today. What is today? It's a time. It's a deadline. The question I ask you, Mr Minister, is very clear. If they haven't reached a settlement on the deadline which the Premier set, which is today, can the people of this province be assured that the ultimatum given by the Premier, "either settle or I'll write the contract," will be enforced tomorrow?

It's very simple. The question the people are asking in this province is, when will this be settled? Your Premier has said, "It must be today or I'll settle it myself." Does that stand? Was that time definite? Was it etched in stone? Is that it? Can we expect a settlement today? If not, will the Premier set the rules himself, sign the contract himself, order everybody back to work and make the deal himself?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The member opposite characterizes the position taken by the Premier as an ultimatum. I would rather use the American term of "jawboning." In fact, the Premier was encouraging both sides to move as quickly as possible today to a settlement. The Premier made it very clear that we would do everything possible to ensure that the power required by the people of this province will be provided, and we're confident that that will be the case.

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** My question is to the Minister responsible for Hydro. Government ministers have taken pains today to tell the House that Hydro has agreed to postpone the shutdown of any of its nuclear reactors until later today. That was clearly the impression given earlier this afternoon. I checked a few moments ago with Hydro officials and they confirmed that three hours ago at Bruce, Hydro began to shut down part of its nuclear power program. That was three hours ago.

What is different about this situation in the spring of 1994 than at any other time are the two following facts: Today Ontario Hydro depends on the nuclear power program for substantially more of the electricity than ever before; some two thirds of the grid is fed from those nuclear power plants. Secondly, because of a significant attrition at the utility, Hydro has not the manpower that it had previously to move in to man these plants. Those



are two critical differences now as opposed to 1990 or 1987 or 1982.

Can the minister confirm, contrary to earlier indications from the government, that at noon today an orderly shutdown of the nuclear power program began, and it began at Bruce?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The information that Ontario Hydro has provided to me is that because of the progress being made, the orderly shutdown which was planned has been slowed and postponed. It is correct—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Obviously, Ontario Hydro will comply with the AECB's requirements. That is their responsibility in terms of ensuring the safety of the system. However, as I indicated, the progress that has been made at Bruce is much slower than it would have been had progress not been made in the negotiations.

**Mr Conway:** A minute ago the House was clearly told that the entire shutdown had been postponed. Now, I know the minister; he's an honourable man. But I'm telling you, the public has a right to some answers. Within 24 hours this entire system goes critical, and there are hospital patients, there are industries and there are farms in this Easter week that will want to know what the hell is going on and what you are doing to ensure that this critical, vital, essential service is going to be maintained.

I ask you yet again: What is the government's contingency plan in the event that hours from now these talks are not successful and that within 24 hours from now we really start to lose a very, very large part of the nuclear power program, without which there will be brownouts and blackouts before Easter weekend?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I know that the member is very concerned. Without getting as apoplectic as he, I would simply say that we all recognize the seriousness of this situation; we recognize the importance of maintaining the electrical power upon which the residents of this province depend. The government is committed to doing that, as is Ontario Hydro and, I believe, the workers at Ontario Hydro.

That's why it is important that we all—all of us in this House as well as over at the hotel—work as hard as we can to bring about a settlement so that we don't have the terrible situations that the member alludes to.

#### POLICE SERVICES

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** My question is to the Solicitor General. Last week, the Ontario Provincial Police announced the closure of the Stayner OPP detachment office. The mayor of the township of Clearview, Mrs Carol Currie, the council, local citizens and I feel betrayed because it is now clear that the OPP and your government made this decision prior to any real consultation taking place.

In 1986, the Liberals cut 24-hour policing in that area of the province. Now you come along and close the OPP detachment at a time when criminal activity within the area is on the rise. Minister, when break and enters, thefts and the crime rate are all dramatically rising, how can you assure the people of the Stayner area that they will

be safe and secure in their own homes and businesses while at the same time you're closing the local OPP detachment office?

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** I appreciate the question from the member because it gives me an opportunity to address a couple of issues that are out there with regard to the amalgamation.

First of all, it's my understanding that there indeed was a high degree of consultation with the public, with community representatives, with local leadership, and that no one should have been caught unawares that we were close to making this type of decision.

Second, let me also say that in all the amalgamations that took place, there is at least the same level of service and in most cases an enhanced level of service as a result of the decisions that were made.

I would just say to the honourable member that the concerns he has raised as to whether or not service has been dropped or whether the residents in this area he represents should feel that they're getting less service should be alleviated by the response that he is getting very directly from me on behalf of the OPP that this is not the case, that we have at least the same level of service and that in most cases it is indeed enhanced.

1450

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I would like, with the indulgence of my colleagues in the House, unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is there unanimous consent to revert to statements? Agreed.

#### STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES ONTARIO HYDRO

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** On behalf of the government, I am pleased to announce that a tentative agreement has been reached between the Power Workers' Union and Ontario Hydro.

*Applause.*

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Obviously, the parties will want the opportunity to make the provisions of the agreement clear to their constituencies. I would just add that it addresses the key issues and that the executive board of the Power Workers' Union will be recommending it to its membership.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** What we did was revert to statements, so it's appropriate to allow up to five minutes for each opposition party to make a statement.

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** We share in the applause, because we're all immensely relieved that there has been an agreement reached.

It would have been very helpful to all of us if the minister had been more forthcoming during his earlier answers and if in fact we could have simply had a recess until the minister could bring back what are the first words of assurance to the public that he was indeed going to be able to ensure that the lights would stay on in the province of Ontario.

We have said all along that we hoped there would be a resolution at the collective bargaining table and we congratulate the parties involved for having resolved this at the collective bargaining table.

I say that sincerely, but I say it without excusing what I suggested earlier today was brinkmanship on the part of the government. I cannot accept the fact that the government had to let public concern on this vital issue reach such heights with no response from the government, nothing except the hope that there would be an agreement reached at the bargaining table, until yesterday we finally had some indication, a vague threat from the Premier that if they did not reach an agreement at the table, he would do something nobody would like.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** The member for Chatham-Kent, come to order.

**Mrs McLeod:** We don't know what subsequent details of the agreement have been reached or what pressures were brought to bear, but I say to this minister and to his government that his silence throughout the period of time while the questions were being asked, questions directed towards this government about its plans, about its responsibility, not its responsibility to get a settlement at the bargaining table—we all hoped there would be a settlement at the bargaining table—but some assurance from this government that it was in fact planning for a contingency if no settlement was reached—there has been no effort on the part of this government throughout this process to communicate with the public. There was only a belated effort on the part of Ontario Hydro to communicate with municipal utilities, which would have been the ones involved in ensuring that reduced power needs could be met.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs McLeod:** There was no attempt until late last week to communicate with the major power users, and that's why we were all flooded with letters of concern from people who wondered what this government was prepared to do to keep the lights on and to avoid the public safety and economic consequences if no agreement was reached.

Since there will undoubtedly not be an opportunity to reflect back on what can be learned—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Stop the clock, please. The Leader of the Opposition is entitled to some time in order to make a statement. I ask the government benches to please come to order and allow her the opportunity to make a statement.

**Mrs McLeod:** The way in which the government has dealt with this issue has done absolutely nothing for public confidence and it certainly has done nothing for business confidence. It has sent a very poor signal to any investors that the response of government and of Ontario Hydro to a pending crisis was simply to write letters to them saying that they can expect the lights would go out.

Two months ago we asked this government to tell the public what it would do to deal with something we've

never faced before, and that was the possibility of a strike which could cause serious public safety concerns under the provisions of Bill 40. We have never had a response from the government on that issue. This government must go back and say, "If we ever face a situation like this in Hydro or any other sector again, how will we deal with the problems we have created with the Bill 40 legislation in place?"

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** Just a couple of quick observations: Like everyone, I'm pleased at the news of a tentative settlement, though perhaps this time more than other times I will really, really want to see this agreement, because I have a feeling that it will be a very interesting agreement.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Conway:** But no, I'm pleased to know that there's a tentative agreement.

I want to say something else, and particularly to people in the House who are much more knowledgeable about the collective bargaining process than I am. I want to just make this point: We now have a situation, and we may as well now be frank and candid about it, at Ontario Hydro, a mammoth public sector monopoly, where largely because of a very substantial nuclear power component, both sides, labour and management, know, and they knew from the very beginning, that we cannot have a strike, because we can no longer take a strike.

For people who prattle on about the collective bargaining process, and we all pay due homage to that, it must be now said that in terms of Ontario Hydro today, everyone who knows anything about the utility knows that we simply cannot tolerate a strike. When you get a situation like that, we all know that certainly colours the bargaining.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** I will offer—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm sorry; I'm interrupting the woodman. I would offer congratulations to the government. A little bit of investigation needs to be taken before we can offer wholly our endorsement of this deal.

Clearly, there are a couple of things I would like to get on the record. Firstly, there must be a review of this collective agreement to see exactly what was given away and what was negotiated out. I think everyone would agree that any party on the opposition benches would be given the opportunity to read the contract before it gives a stamp of approval.

We're glad the lights aren't going out. We are equally glad, if it's a good agreement for the taxpayers in the province of Ontario, that there was an agreement take place.

I want to just cover a couple of other issues. Firstly, I think any party that goes across the floor in the future elections will at least now have a little bit of an easier time dealing with negotiations and collective agreements, because now we know that if we are in government, as part of a collective agreement process the Premier of the day may load a gun, hold it against their head and say, "Settle." That's okay.

If that party goes into opposition and we are lucky



enough to be elected and we are in a situation, I say to the minister, where it's going to be a difficult negotiation, you will stand wholly behind us as part of the collective process, and you may help us load that gun, hold it to their heads and say, "Isn't this collective process in this province wonderful?" I want to get that on the record first.

I thirdly want to say that there were some key issues debated during this negotiation, very key issues this government has taken a position on, which means the key issue was job security. If they negotiated job security out of this contract, I think it's important for this party to know that, because we are going to be faced with some serious and difficult negotiations in the future. As in the past, when you argued about job security being an important agreement in any negotiated settlement, you must accept the fact that we may negotiate those kinds of things out.

1500

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** I hear the Minister of Labour heckling. I doubt very much, sir, if you were in opposition, you would have accepted the ultimatum handed down by your Premier by any other Premier in this province when he said, "Settle or else." I don't think you would have accepted it.

Finally, when we do get an opportunity to review this, I want to know on this floor of the Legislature what the new socialists in Ontario believe and agree with, with the new spin, the tough Bob Rae spin they're putting on this particular issue. The new Bob Rae believes in holding guns to people's heads to negotiate a settlement. The new Bob Rae believes that you can take away job security and you don't negotiate those things in contracts, and I say to you that when we form the next government, we believe in those kinds of things as well.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** I ask the House to come to order. We revert to questions. The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville had the floor with a supplementary to the Solicitor General. There are 22 minutes and 24 seconds remaining on the clock.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### POLICE SERVICES

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** Just to remind everyone, the member for Simcoe West was expressing his concerns about the OPP decision to close the detachment in Stayner. In response, the Solicitor General said that there was full and open consultation and that he was quite pleased with the process.

I want to say once again that the Solicitor General is operating from bad information, very bad information indeed. In fact, the member and the mayor of Clearview and all the officials in the affected area were informed through media reports: not by the OPP, not by your ministry, but through the media.

It's not only Stayner that's closing; it's also detachments in Elmvale, Bradford and Welland. Four communities will lose their OPP detachments and more closures are expected later this week.

Between 1988 and 1992, the OPP's uniformed force increased by 63 people. In the same time period, reported criminal offences increased by over 36,000 incidents, almost 100 per day. I know the minister's going to tell us he's been hiring more officers, but clearly that won't approach the level of officers required, and the minister is closing detachments and supporting those closures and giving his assurances.

I'd like to have the minister indicate to the House and to the people of Stayner and of many other areas across this province just how they can measure the assurances that he's giving them today. Are we going to see reductions in the significant increases in crime levels in those areas? What yardstick are we going to use to be assured that the minister's promises are in fact going to occur, or are they simply empty assurances?

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** I believe, and I think there are a great many other Ontarians who also believe, that the OPP is indeed one of the finest police services in the entire world. In fact, when I was recently meeting with RCMP officers at their training academy as they showed me their process of training new officers, they were very supportive and very congratulatory towards the work that the OPP do.

When somebody says, "How do we decide whether or not police are doing a good job?" when we look to police leadership like Commissioner O'Grady and the other chiefs across the province, when they're saying, as the commissioner is, that a measure like this is not going to affect service and is good for the force, is good for the communities we service, as well as being good for the Ontario taxpayer, I believe Ontarians are going to stand by that and believe it.

I point out to him that the whole concept of amalgamating detachments is nothing new. It's happened for decades with the OPP as it has learned how to make the service more efficient as technology has improved, particularly communications. I would also point out to him that I'm advised by the RCMP that they're going through the same kind of process. Is he going to suggest that the RCMP as well as the OPP aren't meeting his level of safety standards, or is he going to stand by the rest of us and support the professionals who lead the policing services in this province?

##### COMMUNITY PLANNING

**Mr Robert Frankford (Scarborough East):** My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. A recent OMB decision has allowed the possibility of a Price Club superstore being established in Scarborough. This has generated widespread controversy in the community. I'm concerned about the effects that such superstores have on the local economy, and I would add that this is really a widespread issue, as I read media from the US and Britain; they're having to deal with that as well.

As you know, local businesses are a vital part of every community, but they are unable to compete with the mass merchandising and pricing of such superstores. What is your ministry doing to protect the viability of local communities and their economies?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** The member for Scarborough East raises an extremely important point. We should all be concerned about maintaining the viability of local business districts. Recently, my ministry initiated a study to look at ways of controlling the negative impacts of the superstores while ensuring the viability of local business areas. Ultimately, of course, as you know, it will be the consumer who decides the fate of what happens to the retailing industry.

**Mr Frankford:** On this topic of planning, I'm very supportive of the recommendations made by the recent Sewell commission and I believe they are very welcome among residents' groups in my riding. I understand that we are moving forward on reforms to the planning process.

Can I tell my constituents that these reforms provide them the opportunity to deal with planning and the future of their communities in a more proactive manner? When are we going to see changes being made to the planning process that will allow for effective and comprehensive planning to occur in communities across the province?

**Hon Mr Philip:** As the member is aware, the Sewell commission was initiated in response to widespread concerns about Ontario's planning process, which was certainly in a mess from any point of view. A number of useful recommendations to improve the process have emerged. My ministry has also just completed its consultation with the stakeholders and is in the process of finalizing the planning reform package. I expect to bring this to the Legislature shortly.

Reform of Ontario's planning process will not only result in improved efficiencies but also in improved ability of ordinary people and communities to understand what is happening and to participate in the process which ultimately has tremendous impacts on their lives and on their businesses.

I believe that good planning involves people in the decision-making process and ensures that their concerns will be dealt with, and that's precisely what we intend to do in the legislation.

#### FIRE SAFETY

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** My question is to the Minister of Housing. The minister will be aware that both of the fire tragedies that have been referred to by my leader and the member for Mississauga South have occurred in my riding. These tragedies have got a lot of folks upset, obviously, not only here but right across the province.

My concern is with regard to the tone, I guess, of the debate and your response and your answers with regard to safety regulations in Bill 120. We see none. We've asked for them. The mayor of Mississauga asked for them and you dismissed her as being simply supportive of snob zoning, instead of showing serious concern for the safety of her residents.

The mayor has indicated that whether you bring in legislation or regulations to deal with safety or not, she's not going to sit around and wait. She is going to commence inspections in these basement apartments wherever they can be determined they exist.

The report that was referred to by the Solicitor General from the fire marshal's office, and our fire chief sat on it, made a number of recommendations, not the least of which was that where a basement exists with no access to the outside and they want to rent it out as a basement apartment, which is in effect a business, then they must install sprinklers to ensure the safety of the occupants.

Are you prepared to instruct your people today to draft regulations to support the report that was submitted to you and suppressed by you, that was submitted to you by the fire marshal, to ensure the safety of our citizens in this province today?

1510

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** There has been no suppression of any report regarding matters affecting fire safety, especially as they touch on the operation of Bill 120.

Can I point out to the second member from Mississauga who has raised these issues, which are of wide concern and which are in fact a key reason we have introduced Bill 120, that you can't have a situation where there are standards which are enforceable when municipalities say that the apartments are illegal because of zoning. You won't have either owners of properties or tenants in those properties coming forward to get the necessary information and make sure there is adequate safety provision within apartments in houses when municipalities say they are illegal because of zoning, for no other reason but zoning.

When we have a situation where those apartments are legal, then both property owners, whose goodwill I don't doubt, and also tenants can raise the questions that need to be raised and make sure the standards are being put in place. We are fully confident that with the changes to the building code—and it's not accurate to say these have not been made available. Of course they're not in the legislation; they are attached to the legislation. The building code amendments and also the new fire code regulations affecting apartments in houses are very much part of the legislative commitment that's been undertaken by this government, and it is out of concern for the safety of the people who will be living in apartments in houses.

**Mr Mahoney:** I guess the thing that's difficult for us to understand is why the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, why Hazel McCallion, why none of the people who sat through the committee hearings agree with you. Mayor McCallion does not have a particular axe to grind.

**Hon Allan Pilkey (Minister without Portfolio in Municipal Affairs):** Oh, no.

**Mr Mahoney:** Well, she doesn't. Mayor McCallion, I say to the former mayor from Oshawa, is concerned about the safety of the residents who exist in her community. I will admit that some time ago many members of the municipal councils were opposed to them simply based on zoning, but that's changed. They've recognized that during the debate that went on in our time in government and subsequently your time in government.

They have so, Minister. The mayor of Mississauga has said that the number one priority is safety in these situations. You continue to make this some kind of battle



between you and the mayors over zoning. That's not the issue. The issue is that they exist; they exist illegally. Bill 120 will rectify that, but it does nothing to deal with the safety matters.

I asked you specifically if you would agree with the report by the fire marshals wherein they recommend that if access is not granted—let's just be clear on this. We're not talking about stairs up into another dwelling, into the kitchen or the hallway upstairs. You will know from the media reports that in the latest tragedy, the mother tried to get out of the basement window with her baby and was overcome and unable to do it. We can't have these people crawling through small windows, Minister—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place his question, please.

**Mr Mahoney:** —at a time when they're in a panic and running for their lives. Either we have access out to the backyard or the side yard or the street, or we have some safety precautions such as sprinklers. You would insist on this for any commercial operation in this province. They would not be allowed to open their business—

**The Speaker:** Would the member complete his question, please.

**Mr Mahoney:** —without these fire protections. Will you insist today that these very, very important fire protections be put in place in this province, give clear direction to the municipalities of what they can expect from you, and provide safety for these people in our communities?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I want to underline once more, in the hope that the member will understand, that we can write every rule in the world that requires safety standards but we can't get those rules acted upon when those apartments are ruled illegal because of zoning. We have to have a change in the status of the apartments in order to get safety regulations in place.

The member will be interested to learn, and he might actually want to take a look at the proposed regulations which have been tabled, the changes to the Fire Marshals Act—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for York Centre is out of order.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** —which will mean that for situations where there is no access to the outside from an apartment in the house, either one of two things has to happen: There has to be a specially designed exit, a window which meets certain kinds of pull-in standards, or there has to be a sprinkler system. I wish the member would take the time, if he has all this passionate concern, to read the proposed changes which were tabled in the committee as we're discussing Bill 120.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services, based on his comments at his press conference this morning about his government's finally recognizing the existence of welfare fraud in the province of Ontario.

Minister, Ontario is recognized across Canada as having one of the most loosely administered welfare systems in the country. So it was with some concern that when you purported to suggest you were announcing some of the toughest measures in Canada today, when we look at the recommendations we can't find an example.

You were, however, asked by a member of the media about the Quebec legislation, which was raised by myself and my caucus a year and a half ago with you, that empowered more of these eligibility review officers so that while they do this work they have access to information which will assist them.

In Quebec, 70% of the files that were examined with the assistance of this legislation resulted in refunds, reductions or rejections. In fact, it caused a huge influx of Quebec residents drawing welfare in Ontario in communities along our eastern borders.

The fact is that you offered no assurances to the media or to members of this House that anything you have announced today is going to strengthen the ability of eligibility review officers to do their job to investigate properly all the 1.3 million cases in Ontario. Minister, why did you avoid responding even to some of the changes that are set out but would be required by legislation from the Quebec model?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** While the member opposite chooses to colour the announcement today as the government finally recognizing the existence of fraud, he knows we in fact have not only acknowledged the existence of fraud for some time but have been taking steps during that time to curb the level of fraud in the system. The indication I was able to give today of some \$120 million to \$150 million that has been saved in the course of the last year and a half as a result of the measures we've put in place is an indication of our having come down on the issue of fraud and abuse and overpayments in the system. And what I announced today was a heightened process of getting at some of that abuse in the system in a very consistent way.

I do not believe we need to have the kind of sweeping powers given to our workers as exist in the Quebec situation. I am concerned, quite frankly, about what some of those powers have led to. I believe the measures we are putting in place not only respond to the need that's out there; they also happen to respond to the kinds of things that many of the workers in our system have been saying to us need to be done. The kind of systematic review and investigation of every file in the system, with an initial emphasis on the files that we believe are among the highest risk—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** —will give us the answers we need.

**Mr Jackson:** Minister, your best estimate is around \$50 million, yet in Quebec they've saved hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. The city of Thunder Bay, by council resolution, is requesting that you look into these kinds of issues, because within their own municipality, the property tax department can't even talk to the

people who are administering heat and hydro to cross-reference information to help them because of Ontario's privacy laws.

The other issue I want to raise comes from Thunder Bay: Again, in today's press conference you were asked a very straight question about the cohabitation policy. Most provinces in Canada have clarified this issue. You refused to in the press conference. Concerns were raised in the media and you gave them no straight answer.

In a recent welfare fraud case in Thunder Bay, a Judge Stanley Kurisko asked for an expert from your ministry to come and attend court to explain how the cohabitation policy works. The judge asked if someone collecting mother's allowance can legally live with a partner less than three years, the minimum for a common-law relationship. The case involved a woman living with her landlord in the same house. She was subsequently found guilty of fraud in the amount of \$38,500. This is what Judge Kurisko had to say about your regulations: "If this is a loophole"—which is what your expert testified—"it's as big as the Grand Canyon."

1520

All of your announcements today talk about your intention to tighten up the system. We got no evidence that you were providing clarity for these review officers so they could go out and do that job. My question to you is simply this: Will you review the cohabitation policy and give a straight answer to the workers in Ontario?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** Very directly to the question, as opposed to the preamble, that is an issue we are reviewing; that is not an issue I'm able to give the member an answer to today in terms of whether any changes will happen. But that is an issue, because for changes to happen to that issue there would have to be legislative changes, and he knows that. That is on the list of things we are looking at with respect to the issue of potential changes in the legislation, so we may have more to say about that.

I also want to go back to the earlier point the member made and to be very clear with him and others who may be concerned about this that nothing I have said should be construed as anything but support from me for us to continue the work we need to do around the sharing of information between government ministries, between levels of government, between municipalities and the provincial government, and that is also work that is under way. In fact, we are making significant progress towards the signing of agreements with various levels of government that will allow us to share in a much better way that information, which will also help us to address the question of abuse and overpayments in the system.

#### AFFORDABLE HOUSING

**Mrs Irene Mathyssen (Middlesex):** My question is to the Minister of Housing. Minister, last week you announced that the provincial and federal governments had approved the development of 2,074 non-profit homes which will be built in Ontario over the next two years in 28 municipalities, creating accessible and affordable housing and much-needed jobs in construction and in other industries.

Unfortunately, I understand your announcement was less than the positive event it seemed, because it signalled the end of Canada's national housing program. The federal government should be taking a leadership role in housing now more than ever. Social housing makes good economic sense. It creates jobs. It provides decent, affordable housing that lasts for generations. Can you tell me the impact that the cancellation of the federal-provincial non-profit housing program will have in Ontario and what you're doing to try to convince the federal government to maintain its involvement in a national housing program?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** The issue that's been raised by the member is a very important one. For decades in this country, we have had a program which has been supported by the federal government, which was a combination of provincial and federal efforts to produce new units of affordable, non-profit housing in communities across Canada.

During last year's, this is 1993's, federal budget, the Conservative administration at that time announced that, having gradually backed out of this program to create new affordable housing, it was now shutting it down completely and that the allocations to be made in the 1993 program would be the last.

For many provinces, this is an enormous loss of assistance at a time when housing assistance is critical to Canadians, who have been through a tough period over the last two years. We know that here in Ontario, as we wind down the federal-provincial government program, it will mean that we will lose a program that at its peak in 1987 was generating about 6,700 units of new and affordable housing for use by Ontarians, which we very much regret.

#### MOTIONS

##### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that Mr Chiarelli and Mr Ruprecht exchange places in the order of precedence for private members' public business.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

#### PETITIONS

##### VIOLENCE

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I have 23 petitions here with 320 signatures from the Catholic Women's League, women's institutes and business and professional women's clubs, and I would like to read this petition into the record.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;

"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to admire or emulate, but rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of



violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

These petitions are signed by women from Windsor, Wallaceburg, Chatham, Corunna, Ridgetown, Tilbury, Dresden and Thamesville, and I'm very proud to attach my signature to them.

#### EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** Constituents from my riding of Oakville South have asked me table a petition which reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the government should not interfere in business in any way; and

"Whereas any person applying for a job should be judged solely on his or her abilities and experience; and

"Whereas their colour, religion, race or gender or other such characteristics should not enter into the equation; and

"Whereas Bill 79 will establish a quota system by hiring by race, colour, sex or other physical characteristics; and

"Whereas employers should be allowed and required to judge each person as a person and hire them on merit;

"We demand that the government withdraw Bill 79, the Employment Equity Act."

I've signed that, and that's signed by over 1,200 people from Oakville South.

#### HOSPITAL SERVICES

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** I have a petition which is addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Four Counties General Hospital in Newbury, Ontario, provides 24-hour emergency service to an area that covers the four neighbouring corners—Middlesex, Elgin, Kent and Lambton counties, and approximately 18,000 people living in small towns and villages in rural sections of this area; and

"Whereas the hospital has had difficulty in providing medical coverage for its emergency room on a 24-hour, seven-days-a-week basis; and

"Whereas if the hospital cannot get enough doctors to cover, it will have to close its emergency department for part of the 24-hour period, and the nearest emergency departments are 40 to 60 minutes' driving distance away;

"We, the residents of the hospital's service area, need 24-hour emergency coverage and call on the Ministry of Health and the Ontario Medical Association to resolve the critical issue of medical coverage of rural emergency departments immediately."

We have attached the names and signatures on the

petition, and I affix my name to this petition.

#### MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES SERVICE CENTRE

**Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora):** I have a petition that reads:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the following undersigned citizens of Dryden, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"We, the undersigned, call on the Ontario government to maintain the operation of the MNR service centre located on Ghost Lake Road in Dryden. We feel this service is vital to our community, our mills, local businesses and our forests. Closure of this centre will affect a total of 17 jobs in the area and cause an increased cost to Ontario taxpayers in shipping and upgrading Thunder Bay's centre, when a state-of-the-art service presently exists here in Dryden. We can't afford to lose it."

I attach my name to that petition as well.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition of 426 signatures addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas traditional family values that recognize marriage as a union between a man and a woman are under attack by Liberal MPP Tim Murphy and his private member's Bill 45; and

"Whereas this bill would recognize same-sex couples and extend to them all the rights as heterosexual couples; and

"Whereas the bill was carried with the support of an NDP and Liberal majority but with no PC support in the second reading debate on June 24, 1993; and

"Whereas this bill is currently with the legislative committee on the administration of justice and is being readied for quick passage in the Legislature; and

"Whereas this bill has not been fully examined for financial and societal implications,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to stop this bill and future bills which would grant same-sex couples the right to marry and to consider its impact on families in Ontario."

I have signed this petition.

1530

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** I have a petition which is addressed to the Premier of the province, Bob Rae, the Solicitor General, Dave Christopherson, and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. The petition deals with a firearms acquisition certification course. It says:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Premier, Bob Rae, the Solicitor General, David Christopherson, and the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"To change your plans, grandfather responsible firearm owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearm safety course and examination."

On behalf of those constituents, I present this petition.

#### PHOTO-RADAR

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** I have a petition which reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the NDP government of Ontario is planning to implement photo-radar systems to penalize speeding drivers; and

"Whereas the provincial freedom of information commissioner has ruled that the NDP's photo-radar system violates the province's protection of privacy legislation; and

"Whereas there may be a number of legal and constitutional challenges to the NDP's dreaded photo-radar legislation; and

"Whereas the photo-radar system will cost millions of dollars to set up and implement; and

"Whereas the photo-radar fines involve no demerit points"—thank goodness, I say—"which the Minister of Transportation has said are the only way to force the public to obey other highway safety regulations, such as the use of seatbelts; and

"Whereas the photo-radar legislation penalizes the owner of the vehicle"—if you can believe that—"even if they are not responsible for the violation; and

"Whereas there have been concerns raised as to whether the photo-radar technology will accurately measure the speed of all vehicles;"—imagine that—"and

"Whereas a government newsletter quotes a ministry staff person who admits that photo-radar is only being implemented to bring in new revenue to the province;"—there's the secret—"and

"Whereas the NDP government is already wasting too much of the revenue that it already brings in,

"We, the undersigned, demand"—they're demanding this, and I agree with them—"that the NDP government cancel its plans to implement photo-radar and cancel its photo-radar legislation."

Wouldn't that be a good idea? I'm signing this petition because I agree with its contents.

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas several patients from the town of New Tecumseth are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments in Orillia or Toronto; and

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment; and

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in New Tecumseth and one patient is forced to pay for her own nurse; and

"Whereas the government continues to insist they are studying the problem even though they have known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP

Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in New Tecumseth and Collingwood,

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of New Tecumseth."

I've signed my name on this petition.

#### CASINO GAMBLING

**Ms Margaret H. Harrington (Niagara Falls):** I am presenting a petition today on behalf of 33 citizens of my city of Niagara Falls. It says:

"We earnestly desire that the NDP government delay any decision regarding approval of a gambling casino until the Try Another Way Committee addresses Niagara Falls city council on Monday evening, March 28. We are requesting of city council a referendum in this fall's election."

I submit this to the Legislature.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** I have a petition to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 55 would make it illegal, with fines up to \$50,000, for people to make any public statement, written or oral, which ridicules, demeans or discriminates against a person on the grounds of sexual orientation, still undefined. This is a grave threat to free speech in a democratic society.

"Bill 55 is also an attack on freedom of religions which do not condone homosexuality: Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Baha'i, Christian etc.

"We want to maintain our rights to disagree with homosexuality, which in no way should be equated with hatred.

"We have moved away from the position where homosexuals and other special-interest groups are no longer content to express their ideas, but demand that contrary views be suppressed with stiff penalties.

"At the same time, these special-interest groups will be allowed to teach their controversial alternative lifestyles to youngsters in the classrooms.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 55."

This has been signed by 25 of my constituents, and I will also sign the petition.

#### PSYCHOTHERAPY

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have a petition, signed by over several hundred residents of Ontario, addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the profession of psychotherapy is currently unregulated; and

"Whereas many former psychotherapy patients have expressed concerns related to patient abuse, professional incompetence and negligence; and

"Whereas these former patients have nowhere to turn to have their complaints or concerns heard;



"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to institute regulations for the profession of psychotherapy, including defined procedures, professional qualifications and ethical standards and an avenue for client complaints and retribution."

In support of this petition, I'm affixing my signature.

#### LAP DANCING

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** I have another petition which was forwarded to me by a number of constituents of mine:

"We, the undersigned, are opposed to the ruling on lap dancing in strip bars. We feel that it violates any code of morality or decency. We want steps taken to overturn this decision."

On behalf of those constituents, I present their petition.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming):** To the Ontario Premier, Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination;

"Whereas you should have followed the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms we have no desire to own,

"I/we, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearm owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have a petition to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, sex and age, we believe all such references should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

I support this petition.

1540

#### TUITION FEES

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale):** To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the NDP promised, throughout many election campaigns, to eliminate tuition fees for college and university students; and

"Whereas the NDP broke this election promise in its first year in office; and

"Whereas since the NDP took office, they have already raise tuition fees by 22% and are planning to raise tuition fees by an additional 20% over the next two years; and

"Whereas the NDP government has cut over \$250 million in funding to colleges and universities, forcing many institutions to raise non-tuition student fees to make up the missing revenue; and

"Whereas the government has cut the student grants program for post-secondary students and replaced it with a smaller loan program; and

"Whereas everyone agrees that we need to encourage students to become more highly trained and skilled through post-secondary education to ensure that our province can compete in the changing economy; and

"Whereas student unemployment is at an all-time high, double-digit levels already, leaving further education as the only hope for real jobs for many of our young people,

"We, the undersigned, urge the province to restore quality and accessibility to the post-education system by holding the line on tuition increases and making it more affordable for our youth to receive the skills and training they require."

I will affix my signature to this petition because I am wholeheartedly in agreement with it.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### NORTH TORONTO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB ACT, 1994

On motion by Ms Poole, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr104, An Act to revive North Toronto Business and Professional Women's Club.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON AND FRENCH-LANGUAGE SCHOOL BOARDS STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

##### LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT DES LOIS CONCERNANT LA MUNICIPALITÉ RÉGIONALE D'OTTAWA-CARLETON ET LES CONSEILS SCOLAIRES DE LANGUE FRANÇAISE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 143, An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and to amend the Education Act in respect of French-Language School Boards / Projet de loi 143, Loi modifiant certaines lois relatives à la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et la Loi sur l'éducation en ce qui a trait aux conseils scolaires de langue française.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** I believe the member for Carleton had the floor.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** Last Thursday

I was speaking on this Bill 143, which supersedes Bill 77. Just to bring people up to date, Bill 143 restructures local and regional government in Ottawa-Carleton. The most important parts of Bill 77 are the creation of a regional police force and the fact that the regional government of Ottawa-Carleton, if Bill 143 passes, will in fact mean that local mayors of the 11 municipalities will be kicked off regional council where they now sit.

One of the issues I wanted to raise today was the newspaper ad which this minister took out, I believe two or three months ago. I was interested in the Speaker saying that the ad put in by the Minister of Municipal Affairs was close to contempt. I have never heard that in this House before. In the 16 years I've been here, I've never heard a minister of any government be accused of being close to contempt in terms of what he tried to do with government money in terms of putting forward the arrogance of this government in dealing with Bill 77 and Bill 143.

That's what drew the Speaker's mind to that ruling, the fact that this minister said that this bill will be law on a certain day in the future, totally disrespecting the rights of every member of this Legislature in dealing with this bill, the opportunity to debate this bill and convince the minister, convince the government, convince the other members of this Legislature that Bill 143 is bad law and should not be carried.

It also throws into the face of all of those people we hopefully will be hearing down in Ottawa in public hearings on Bill 143 to determine whether or not they will have some say in moving this minister from his very arrogant stand on this bill—and that arrogance has been proven by the Speaker's ruling today in this Legislature at an earlier time.

Although our standing orders do not provide an opportunity for a standing committee of this Legislature to travel away from Toronto during the time a session is in, I want to make it clear that my party will waive any kind of necessary consent required to have hearings take place in and around the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. We deem it as absolutely essential that there be hearings in that place because this bill deals primarily with the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

I want to make it clear that the government cannot hide behind the standing orders in terms of saying, "We can't travel to Ottawa to have public hearings," as far as the Progressive Conservative Party is concerned. I believe you will also get that assurance from the opposition party, but I will let them speak for themselves.

I dealt with a number of issues on Thursday. One was the proportional representation argument that this minister has used: rep by pop. This has been his excuse for not allowing local mayors to sit on regional council, because in Ottawa-Carleton, of the 11 municipalities that we have, we have the city of Ottawa with some 350,000 people, approximately speaking, and it goes down to municipalities with 14,000 or 15,000, and there is one very, very small municipality, that of the village of Rockcliffe with 2,500 people.

The argument that the minister has put forward time and time again to the public because it's popular, people

seem to understand it or think they understand it, is this rep-by-pop argument.

What happened was, as I said before, the municipalities came in and said, "Well, let's have a weighted voting system." The minister says, "This is too complicated." Yet the minister himself, his own ministry last fall approved the weighted voting system in the county of Hastings which allowed five different levels of voting, depending upon the population of the various areas in the county of Hastings.

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** How many mayors in the county of Hastings?

**Mr Sterling:** Lots of reeves sit on the county council and they're elected in the same municipalities as the mayors are sitting, in answer to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I believe a lot of the people in the county system of government would be quite willing to entertain the idea of having mayors sit on county council, but reeves are elected in the same areas as mayors and are the representatives of those areas on it.

I also referred to the 1990 election returns for our province because the minister likes to put out the fact that rep by pop is very, very important. It's absolutely necessary to the T in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. Yet when we look at our own 130 ridings in this province, we find out that there are ridings which have as many as five times the population of other ridings.

Some of those ridings are in remote areas. They have large geographical areas to cover and members of this Legislature have agreed over a period of time to allow that as an exception.

In our regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, on the outer areas, we have some fairly large geographically situated townships. We have the township of West Carleton, which is I believe the largest-populated township in all of Ontario.

**Hon Mr Philip:** How many square miles?

**Mr Sterling:** It's 65,000 square hectares, so if you'd like to translate that into square miles, you can go ahead. I use hectares.

**Hon Mr Philip:** It is like in Germany.

**Mr Sterling:** Anyway, Mr Speaker, the minister is getting upset because he's seeing his rationale which he's tried to sell to the public fading away, and I can understand his concern because when we get down to public hearings in Ottawa-Carleton, I will agree to waive our consent providing the minister comes down and sits with the committee and hears first hand what the people of Ottawa-Carleton are willing to say. I want him there because, Mr Speaker, as you know, if he sends his parliamentary assistant, who may not have any power to change the legislation, the impact of these people will be very much counted out.

1550

Now, maybe his schedule is too busy to come down to Ottawa-Carleton. Maybe it's not of any concern to him that the people of Ottawa-Carleton are so alarmed and upset with this. But I certainly hope and I'm sure that the minister would not be so arrogant as not to come down



to Ottawa-Carleton and hear at first hand what the people are saying.

I want to say that part of the selling of this restructuring has been that there aren't going to be any more politicians than there were in the past. I believe it is just about the same. I believe that maybe there are four or five more politicians under this new scheme as under the old scheme.

But do you know what the minister has failed to talk to the people about? The cost of the new system, how much more it's going to cost for politicians' salaries and office expenses under Mr Philip's scheme as opposed to the present one.

The region, in early January of this year, decided for these 18 new regionally elected councillors that they're going to need 18 new offices, and \$2.3 million of the taxpayers' money in Ottawa-Carleton is going for renovations to set up for these new regionally elected councillors and their staffs.

What is happening with regard to the salaries of these individuals? Well, a Peat Marwick study shows that probably the salaries will come in somewhere around \$60,000 to \$65,000 per regional councillor. Office expenses are expected to be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$100,000 for each new regional councillor. Now, \$160,000 for each new regional councillor times 18 comes to the exciting amount of \$2.8 million a year, \$2.9 million almost, in regional councillors' salaries and expenses.

You may say, "Well, that may be the case, but this is offset by the people we're taking off local government," because, as I said, the number of politicians starting out in this exercise over the whole region is approximately equal to the number of politicians who are there now and will be there after Bill 143, should it ever pass.

The fact of the matter is that we're replacing people like councillors in the township of West Carleton, who are getting the princely sum of \$12,500 a year, by people who are going to be expending \$160,000 in taxpayers' money on an annual basis. That's what we're seeing here put forward by the NDP government in this bill. You are replacing part-time people who are working for relatively small amounts of money by people who are full-time politicians and have office staffs.

Now, in the city of Ottawa, we presently have 15 councillors sitting in the city of Ottawa who also sit on regional council. The councillors in Ottawa receive about \$30,000 each from the city of Ottawa and they receive about \$21,000 from the region. Total: \$51,000. They also have an office budget at the city of Ottawa of about \$60,000 a year.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** What does that add up to?

**Mr Sterling:** That's \$60,000 plus \$50,000: about \$110,000. Now, they're not going to be working at the region any more, but what's going to happen with regard to their budget? Well, the most recent proposal that they're putting forward, and there's going to be a whole week's public debate over the next little while, is they're going to up their salaries that the city is paying, from

\$30,000 to \$51,000. So they're only going to have one job now, and that's down at the city of Ottawa. They are no longer going to have to be on a regional government. But they're going to get the same pay.

I also want to say that because they're dropping the number of councillors in the city of Ottawa from 15 to 10, the councillors deem that they're going to have to serve more constituents.

**Mr Stockwell:** Their office budget.

**Mr Sterling:** So their office budget is going up. How did you guess?

**Mr Stockwell:** I don't know.

**Mr Sterling:** It's going up from \$60,000 to \$90,000 a year.

**Mr Stockwell:** What is the total?

**Mr Sterling:** The total of a new office for a city councillor will now become \$140,000. What we're going from are people who have two responsibilities now as regional councillors and they're costing the taxpayers per piece \$110,000. Now we're taking away the regional function and these city councillors are going to cost us \$140,000. Now, that's economy. That's the economy of the NDP government. That's really, really sound economy.

What is happening over this as well is that in some municipalities—say, for instance, the township of Rideau is presently paying its mayor some \$22,500.

**Mr Stockwell:** Plus \$21,000.

**Mr Sterling:** And he's receiving \$21,000 from the regional government. But his councillors are getting about \$18,500 from the township of Rideau. We're now put in the situation where we're kicking that mayor off regional council, so his sole function will be at the township of Rideau as the mayor. His councillors are getting \$18,500; he's getting \$22,500. I want to ask you, Mr Speaker, whether or not he might feel that there is a slight bit of injustice with regard to his responsibilities as the mayor versus one of the four new councillors whom we'll be setting up there. I venture to say there will be some upward pressure in terms of increasing his salary, as there will be some upward pressure in terms of increasing the salary of the mayor of the township of West Carleton, who is presently receiving \$28,000.

One of the things that perhaps people like the minister, who comes from the large area of Metro Toronto, don't understand is that when you're the mayor of a township of 14,000 or 15,000 people and somebody walks through your door and they have a problem, they have a problem that is really not related to township or local government but it's related to a problem which either the provincial government, the regional government or even the federal government is involved in. Most mayors don't turn people away. They are the focal point in small communities of that size and they take on that problem and they deal with that problem.

I say if you have somebody who is trying to pay them \$24,000 or \$28,000, you're not going to get many people who are going to fulfil that function to the same degree as perhaps we would wish. Therefore, I think there's going to be a lot of upward pressure on the salaries of

mayors who are receiving part of their pay at the present time from regions.

We have a situation here where we're creating directly regionally elected people who will be paid somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$60,000 to \$65,000 a year, will have an office budget of \$100,000, and we're getting rid of some people who are getting a stipend or a part of their payment of \$21,000 flat from the region. I might point out that all of the people who were on regional council up to this point in time have not received any office expenses from the regional government. All they did was pay this particular stipend to them.

The bottom line of all this is that this government is forcing upon the regional property taxpayers of Ottawa-Carleton \$2.3 million—I think that's the budget amount they put forward; no, in fact, it's \$2.9 million—almost \$3 million in capital renovations to set up these new offices. The net result is that the taxpayer of Ottawa-Carleton overall is going to be putting out somewhere between \$1.5 million and \$2.5 million a year more in salaries to politicians and in office expenses to politicians.

1600

That's some great saving, and I just say to the taxpayers of Ottawa-Carleton, I don't believe you're going to get much better government out of this new scheme than under the old scheme. In fact, I think you're going to get poorer government because you're not going to have the input of the most knowledgeable people of all at the regional level, and I'm talking about the local mayors.

I also mentioned the other day about policing and received a special response from an area which I represent, and that's the city of Kanata, which is presently contracting with the Ontario Provincial Police. I would ask the minister to consider an amendment to his legislation to allow the police services board which exists in the city of Kanata to remain intact until the regional police force in fact wants to expand out into the areas which are presently served by the Ontario Provincial Police.

At the present time, the main function of the new regional police board will be to combine the police forces of Nepean, Gloucester and Ottawa. That will be their main function. They're not really that concerned with policing the outer areas. I say wherever a municipality is in fact contracting with the OPP, why not let it deal directly with the OPP rather than going through this big regional police board? Why not wait until they're ready to take that step, and if the same police force will service all of the other area, why not do it at that point in time?

I want to also add that I did receive some information on the unfunded sick liability in the Ottawa police force. It's \$23 million, I have been informed. I do not think it's fair to shove that unfunded liability out over all of the rest of the taxpayers in the region. If the city of Ottawa has failed to meet its obligations in that regard, I believe it should, on the amalgamation of these police forces, write a cheque for \$23 million to the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. That should be kept in a fund to pay out the unfunded sick days that have been incurred by the police force in the city of Ottawa.

I just think it's patently unfair for taxpayers in the

future to pay for what I call shoddy fiscal management. When you give out a benefit, I believe you should put that money away and that money should be there to pay for those future benefits. I believe that's also the case of the unfunded sick leave in the Gloucester police force and I think they should be required to sit down and write a cheque for whatever that unfunded liability is.

As I said the other day, I believe that the municipality should be compensated for any benefits which a police force brings to the regional police force and I believe the municipality should have to put in any money to the regional police force for anything that was unfunded.

The last part I want to talk about is the overwhelming support across this province for the position I am taking—that is, that we scrap Bill 143, particularly those sections dealing with taking mayors off regional council.

I've been really upset with the way the minister has characterized this debate. He has tried to characterize this debate as local mayors trying to hold on to their own jobs, and that's how he's tried to play it in the press and in the public in the Ottawa-Carleton area. I know these people; I know them quite well; I represent five of them. I want to tell you this: They are disgusted with that particular position. They truly believe that they know what is going on in their particular municipalities and that decisions will be made with regard to this regional government which will not be in the best interests of the area and they look at it from that point of view.

The offer put forward by the minister back in November with regard to leaving the mayors on for only one more term was really a non-starter. It put the mayors in the further difficult position of trying to hold to a position which they believe in principle, and they're not about to be bought off by one more term until the end of my term and then the next mayors will have to worry about whatever happens.

I received a huge number of letters of support. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario has strongly endorsed the position of the township of West Carleton, the township of Goulbourn and the city of Kanata, the township of Osgoode, the township of Rideau, the city of Nepean and Gloucester, Vanier, Rockcliffe Park, Cumberland, all of those particular areas. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario says this government is wrong in taking mayors off of regional council.

I have in front of me a number of letters of support which have been written to the township of West Carleton. They sent to all of these particular townships and municipalities their resolution which says that Bill 143 should be done away with.

I think it's most important to note. I want to read from a few of those, and I say "only a few of those." The city of Waterloo: "The legislation changes could have significant impact on the future of local governments in Ontario where the bill invades the legislative rights of lower-tier municipalities, destroys an important role of the head of council and increases the cost to the taxpayer; and

"Whereas the legislation demonstrates that the provincial government continues to entangle itself in the affairs



of local government while still demonstrating a lack of demonstrating of the functions and operation of local government," therefore they resolve to endorse the West Carleton resolution.

This is from the township of Muskoka Lakes: "Before the provincial government adopts any proposal for reorganization of an upper-tier government in Ontario which results in an upper-tier council that does not, at the very least, include the heads of local councils as members of the upper-tier council, they will undertake a thorough examination of the advantages and disadvantages of the long-term implications of efficient, effective, accessible local government."

You know, that's one of the grinding parts of all of this: We haven't seen any financial data put forward by the government as to what this is going to mean in terms of cost. We haven't had the minister stand up and say what kind of interim funding he's going to provide. He said he's going to provide some funding in certain cases, but there's been nothing put to paper.

The town of Tillsonburg says that the restructured Oxford, which has been there since 1975, had "a mayor of each municipality represented on the restructured county council as well as the other elected representatives at the area municipal level. The representation has been beneficial in providing representation from the area municipalities on the county council. The concern of town council will be that this bill would establish a precedent within the province of Ontario for this elimination of area mayors on upper-tier council."

The township of Chisholm: This is a letter to Ed Philip, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. "Council is deeply concerned with your government's blatant disregard of concerns expressed by lower-tier representatives and those of your own consultants with respect to this legislation."

1610

What they refer to by "disregarding your own consultants" is the fact that this minister has failed to follow what both government studies recommended: The Bartlett report and the Kirby report, the two studies he's principally relying on, both recommended that area mayors sit on regional council.

The town of Durham in a letter to Ed Philip: "Your government has repeatedly billed itself as a government built on the principles of openness and consultation. The resolutions which we have received from local councils in the Ottawa-Carleton area seem at odds with those statements. Durham council strongly urges you to rethink your position on this matter."

The Western Ontario Wardens' Association: "In the opinion of this association, the accepted role of the upper tier as an extension of local government is to provide those services which can be provided on a more efficient and effective basis across a broader area and not to strengthen its role at the expense of local government."

Last, from the city of Toronto: "There is generally held consensus"—and this is from Robert Millward, commissioner, who was dealing with remarks on Bill 77—"on local councils in Metro that direct election to Metro

council as introduced in 1988 was a mistake. That step has led to increased jurisdictional competition between the two levels of government and has added to pressures for amalgamation.

"The legislative amendments now under consideration for Ottawa-Carleton go beyond direct election because it removes mayors from regional council and creates wards which cross municipal boundaries. If applied to Metro, these measures would compound problems introduced by direct election. Rather than taking the direct election approach further, it would seem more appropriate to reverse the 1988 change in direction respecting regional government in this province. Accordingly, it is recommended that you withdraw" Bill 143. Of course, these all refer to Bill 77, but that was changed at the last minute by this particular minister.

I do not have the time to read in even all the names of the various municipalities from across this province that agree with the stance I've taken and the stance which the township of West Carleton, the township of Goulbourn, the city of Kanata, the township of Osgoode and the township of Rideau, which I all represent, have taken, as well as some of the others which other members of this Legislature have put forward.

The most troubling part of this legislation and the bottom line, to me, is that the areas I represent—and I have been a member of this Legislature for some 16 years now and have known a number of mayors who have represented the municipal areas I represent. I have a great deal of respect for these people. The public is getting a very, very good deal with regard to all of these people: They work hard; they've made what I consider reasonable decisions; they've consulted carefully with the people they represent. When I talk to some of those people who are now elected in those positions, they are really discouraged. They are discouraged because this government is diminishing their role to a role which perhaps was adequate 20, 25, 35 years ago.

These people are intelligent people who have given to their community to an extensive degree, and this government has chosen to slam them and take them on. That's the most disturbing part, and some of them are even talking about not running again as mayors of their particular municipalities. Whether that will come about or not, I don't know; I think it will come about at least in two of those cases.

Therefore, I urge the government to rethink this. Of course, I urge them to go to Ottawa to hear the people, and after they hear the people, I'm sure they will rethink it.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Questions or comments?

**Hon Ed Philip:** I was interested in the gyrations of the honourable member as he tried to defend the status quo and vested interests rather than taking care of the interests of the taxpayers and of the business community in the Ottawa-Carleton area.

Both Kirby and Bartlett clearly recommended that in order to have a regional focus, there be a direct election of councillors. That was the main theme in both of their reports. Indeed Bartlett said, on reading our bill, that if he

had the report to do over again, he would have recommended that the mayors not sit on the regional council.

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** When and where did he say that?

**Hon Mr Philip:** Yes, that's exactly the point.

The member raises the issue of regional council's salaries. Of course the regional council is conducting its own study to find out exactly what expenses and indeed what salaries will be. If the honourable member is suggesting that somehow the provincial government of Ontario should set salaries or salary levels for municipally elected people, let him say that. Let him tell the people of Ontario, let him tell each and every municipality, that the position of the Conservative Party is that Queen's Park, Big Brother here, sets the salaries and salary levels, or caps the salaries. We don't have any evidence that there's any support for that.

We believe that local people can best decide, along with their councils, what the salary levels will be in their own communities, and that it is the taxpayers and the voters in those places who will decide if there is or is not an abuse.

This government was the first government that actually set a cap on our own salaries and indeed put a freeze in for three years. I didn't see the member's friends in the Mulroney government do that in the House of Commons for the cabinet and the members in the House of Commons. The member is trying to defend the—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you. Your time has expired.

**Mr Daigeler:** I will get back to the tirade of the Minister of Municipal Affairs in due course when I get a chance to speak in this House. Unfortunately, under the new rules that the NDP, in its draconian method, has instituted, I will get only half an hour to put my views on the record. However, I can assure the minister that my views will be very forceful.

The member for Carleton has very clearly and carefully and in a reasoned manner put forward our cost concerns and a number of other very clear and strong concerns that the people in the suburban municipalities of Ottawa-Carleton have. Very clearly, as the member for Carleton knows, the suburban municipalities have worked with the region. It is not as though they have not cooperated with the other municipalities. Their record is very clear.

I wasn't here at all times when the member spoke, but that's perhaps something that, based on his experience, he might want to reiterate: that we in Nepean, in Kanata, in the areas the member for Carleton represents, cannot be accused of being parochial, because we have cooperated with the region. We have done our share, but we have done our share in consensus—that's the important part—and not coercion.

That's what the member for Carleton was trying to say, and he put forward a number of very excellent arguments that I will refer to as well a little later on. The member for Carleton was able to speak for an hour and a half as the person speaking for his whole party, because under the new rules one person is allowed an hour and a half

and everybody else can only speak for half an hour. He very clearly has put a great number of concerns forward, and I would surely hope that the minister at least partially listens to what the member for Carleton has said.

1620

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I would like to second the congratulations from the Liberal Party to the member for Carleton for quite an excellent response to Bill 143. It's a shame that the minister has had to resort to invoking the ghost of Brian Mulroney in terms of criticizing what the member for Carleton had to say, because the member for Carleton made a number of excellent points. The member has been consistent in trying to ensure that the general public in the Ottawa-Carleton region is aware of all the issues and has an opportunity to respond to all the issues through a public hearing, and he's called on the minister to bring that public hearing to Ottawa-Carleton.

If, as the minister says, there's all sorts of support for this, it will become evident in the Ottawa-Carleton region, and I call on the minister to do that. But the member for Carleton has pointed out that none of the reports—not Kirby, not Bartlett, not any of the reports—has recommended leaving the mayors off the regional council, not one of them. The general public has not had an opportunity to speak to that, to have that issue debated.

The issue of the boundaries: The general public has not had a good opportunity to speak to the boundaries, the local boundaries, the regional boundaries. They've simply not had this opportunity, and the member for Carleton is saying, "Allow the public to have that debate, to have that information."

The member for Carleton raises the issue of cost. I'm sure the people in Ottawa-Carleton are not aware of the costs associated with the government the minister is proposing. The regional councillors will have executive assistants and secretaries, their salaries will go up, there will be newsletters, conferences, conventions, new offices, and the member has pointed out that the cost could be \$1.5 million to \$2.5 million. Surely we should go to Ottawa-Carleton and let the people know these facts.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I'd like to congratulate my friend. He puts forth a very excellent case. It may not be one I agree with. He, of course, is very strongly opposed to the idea of representation by population, of equity at the regional and municipal levels. We know from surveys done in the Ottawa area that 80% of the people support the proposed reforms.

**Mr Daigeler:** Nonsense.

**Mr White:** I hear one of the Liberal members yelling "Nonsense," yet my friend also states in his speech on Thursday, this same speech, that 71% of the people supported these reforms.

I understand how difficult it is to change from a situation where the vote of one person is equal to 100 to a situation where the vote of one person may be more or less equal to that of another. I understand that changing this setup in Ottawa-Carleton, which was the first



regional setup involving a number of different municipalities that weren't directly linked, as Metro Toronto is, changing that situation from one of inequity, such as it had in 1969 when it was set up under a Conservative government, to one which has a larger degree of equity, is problematical.

We have a situation now where the vote of one person in the municipality of Rockcliffe Park, I believe, is equal to 100 in the city of Ottawa. This disproportion is not borne out in the rest of the province. This inequity does not relate to that of members of provincial Parliament.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Carleton, you have two minutes to reply.

**Mr Sterling:** The government, particularly the minister—his responses, quite frankly, are quite silly. I wish he would debate the main issue. The main issue in this whole part is, number one, that he's promised to defray some costs, and he hasn't given any hard facts on that. Number two, he says that the people want reform in Ottawa. They want reform in Ottawa, but the people also say they want the local mayors on regional council; 80% of the people say that, 79%, a poll I took in September.

**Hon Mr Philip:** Oh, your poll.

**Mr Sterling:** Yes, a poll, an independent poll.

**Hon Mr Philip:** That was really scientific.

**Mr Sterling:** Yes, it was scientific; actually, it was. I'll give you a copy of it, if you'd like, Minister.

The minister is trying to invoke the ghost of Brian Mulroney in this. I find it amazing that these cabinet ministers, who received a \$30,000 salary increase when they came to government in 1990, then froze their salaries—I find that really quite generous, to freeze your salary at \$30,000 above whatever you have ever earned in your life.

The fact of the matter is that this government is setting up a government structure in Ottawa which is going to lead to more full-time politicians and more office expenses and higher salaries. Nobody in this Legislature is setting any salaries, but I'll tell you that the structure you're setting up, Mr Minister, gives municipal politicians every right to demand the kind of money that they're putting down on paper now.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further debate?

**Mr Bernard Grandmaitre (Ottawa East):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I heard the minister very clearly that the honourable member from Carleton was misleading the House. I think this is very unparliamentary and I ask the minister to withdraw it.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I must admit that I did not hear the comment. Obviously, though, if the minister has said that, I know for a fact that he will apologize.

**Hon Mr Philip:** I believe I did say it, and I withdraw the remark.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further debate?

**Mr White:** I am pleased to rise in my place to support this bill.

**Mr Daigeler:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think the people who have spoken so far were the critics for the parties. Is it not normal, then, that we begin the

rotation with the official opposition again?

**The Deputy Speaker:** We followed a rotation. It was Mr Sterling, who is the critic, Mr Grandmaitre is the critic, the minister had the occasion also to speak. It's now the turn of the member for Durham Centre. Then it will go in rotation. The next person would be the member for the official opposition.

**Mr White:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am very pleased that you allow the government members some opportunity to speak, while the member for Nepean would not. I am pleased to rise in my place to support this bill that welcomes in a new time, a new era for the region of Ottawa-Carleton. This is an area not unlike Durham, where the people have for a long time called for action, called for reform of the regional system.

As we know, this is the oldest area in the province. Where people have said, "If it's not broke, don't fix it," this is an area where the system of government is not working efficiently, where the people of this area have called out long and hard for reform, as we have already heard. For Ottawa-Carleton now is the time for action, and this is the government that listens to the people of Ottawa-Carleton and to their needs for reform, for accountable, effective government. Now is indeed the time for action.

This bill brings to a close a very long process of public discussion on how the people of Ottawa and Carleton are best served by government at the regional and the local levels. We've had the Ottawa-Carleton problem studied, commissioned, discussed by councils, by committees and at public meetings to such a great degree that people do not want more of the same, more debate, more discussion. We have had years of debate and years of discussion and we now have a conclusion of that debate, which I think most of the people in that region wish to have.

People in Ottawa-Carleton want to know what they will be voting for in this fall's municipal election, and they want provincial leadership to offer them the opportunity to have accountable elected leadership.

Mayo, Bartlett, Graham, Kirby and Bourns have all done outstanding jobs at speaking with groups, organizations and individuals on what the future of that region should look like and how the regional political structures can support that future. They have all held public hearings in Ottawa-Carleton. There has been much thoughtful discussion—

**Mr Sterling:** Why didn't you follow it?

**Mr White:** —some yelling, some large, unruly crowds, some heckling and some very positive input with very good ideas.

1630

The consultation is now over, the studies are done, the reports are in and our government has listened. What did people say? People have said that they're overgoverned at the local level. Their local government is too complicated and too heavy with duplication. They don't want 14 different levels for the decision-taking process. Their local government is already felt to be too complex and too unwieldy. The levels of government are too difficult to understand, especially the who-does-what things

involving municipal and regional government.

As it presently stands, people have difficulty enough understanding what the four levels of government do. There are times when we, as members who are cognizant constantly of those issues, are ourselves a little bit curious. In Ottawa-Carleton those issues reached the fore of confusion and ambiguity. People in Ottawa-Carleton want to know who will clean up the river. They want to know someone will take responsibility and not just pass the buck between different levels of government.

They want to know who they can look to at the local level to create jobs and a plan for future economic security. They want one local government to create jobs for the record number of young people who are bidding their time in the academic shelters of Carleton, Algonquin, la Cité and the University of Ottawa until the Ottawa job market improves.

The people of Ottawa-Carleton want to know who they can hold accountable for their property tax bills. They do not want to face countless excuses from councillors and trustees that it's the others' fault, someone else's fault, the other region's, because the whole thing is too complicated.

They want to directly elect the regional councillors who are responsible for \$1 billion of their tax dollars. They want to look after the interests of the regional council, and local councillors should look after their business at the municipal council.

#### *Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Order, please, all members. The member has the floor and he has it very legitimately. The member for Durham Centre, please continue.

**Mr White:** Thank you again, Mr Speaker. The people of Ottawa and Carleton want to know that there's a strong regional government planning for a safe and environmentally sound future. They had what at the time was a progressive form of government, but that was 25 years ago and we have seen improvements since, both in their local form of government in that region and elsewhere across the province.

They want to have a government that is responsive to the issues of limiting urban sprawl and protecting precious environmental areas that keep farmers on the land and not just land speculators. They want to have a single local police force in the region and not the changing quiltwork of police services which currently exists.

The people of Ottawa-Carleton say that the system is broken and they want us to fix it. As it stands presently, that is the only way. I am proud to stand here as a member of our government, a government that will try to fix the problem. This bill gives the people of that region the tools they need for a better local government, a more responsive and a more accountable local government.

This bill will eliminate the inherent conflict of municipal councillors holding regional office. It will also give the voter accountability of their regional tax dollar through direct election to council, which spends that \$1 billion of local taxes. This bill will give clear leadership for economic development to the regional municipality.

They will be able to more effectively plan for the industries, infrastructure and development which will create the jobs which our people need.

The unified police services in Ottawa-Carleton will see a single force in Ottawa, Nepean and Gloucester, with the option of spreading throughout the region, being available to the new police services board. Currently people in West Carleton, Osgoode, Cumberland, Rideau, Goulbourn, communities which have populations of over 10,000 people, receive their police services without direct charge from the OPP. While Cumberland gets free police servicing, Kanata, a city of roughly the same size, represented by my friend opposite, has to pay for policing from the same OPP.

Does my friend suggest that his constituents should be paying while constituents of another member receive services free, where the majority of people in our province pay for police servicing and some do not? Is that equitable? We need to fix this kind of inequity. We need to ensure that everyone pays a reasonable amount and that most of us are not paying while some are not.

With a regional police services board responsible for regional policing, the service will be more efficient and the costs of the service will be spread more equitably. I'm very pleased that our provincial government is also committed to providing transition costs to the region during the startup years.

This bill, combined with the recently passed Bill 7, the waste management bill, will allow the regional municipality to take on a stronger role as the environmental problem-solver for the region. We all recall the importance of that Bill 7, how it helps deal with the municipal waste management and how strongly supported it was by all members of this House.

The bill will eliminate one of the administrative levels of the school boards in the region, the combined section of the Ottawa-Carleton French-language school board, and it will leave the public and separate panels which are currently in place to carry on. This will allow for greater efficiencies within those school boards. Along with the work that's been ongoing with local school boards on cooperative services, we'll be helping to make the school system more efficient and more accountable. This bill shows we have listened.

I know there have been extraordinary efforts made by some local mayors to have their personal representation protected on regional council, and I respect their determination to be heard and their ability to attract some support. I also believe the time has come when a decision must be made, and that time is now.

It is of course with great reluctance that those who hold power, whether with equity and justice or not, release that power, release those bonds. But we are seeing in Ottawa-Carleton a fairly peaceful transition in that regard.

No one in Ottawa-Carleton has shown me a system of simple direct election which would produce a democratic result and still include the local mayors on regional council. Representative democracy means that every voter gets an equal vote. As we've heard discussed already,



why should the mayor of Rockcliffe Park, with 2,500 constituents, carry the same weight as the mayor of Ottawa, with her 340,000 constituents? There we're talking about one person's vote being equal approximately to 170 people's votes. Somehow, that would seem to be anti-democratic.

The issue of reasonable equity is guaranteed to Canadians. We're not talking of a straight one for one but a level of reasonable equity. Certainly those members of this House are elected from constituencies that are determined by population, by location, by geographical size, by a number of different factors, but population and representation by population is certainly one very important one, and were one of us to have 100 constituents for one of the other member's constituents, that would be seen to be dreadfully anti-democratic. That's the situation we have in Ottawa-Carleton, and that's the situation that's being changed.

I can't support any of the various weighting schemes that have been suggested over the last year. They're difficult to understand. They create a clumsiness and an inequity. We don't want to have that; we want to have government which is accountable, which is sensible, which is accessible to the people of that region, and simpler: simple enough that even the members of this House, all of us, can understand it. As long as the 11 Ottawa-Carleton local municipalities have the disparate population differences they do have, the numbers can't work. So the mayors are not going to be represented on regional council. That's a local solution to a local problem.

In other areas, my friend opposite suggests, "Why should the mayors in Durham be on regional council or the mayors in Metro be on Metro council?" In those areas that opposition is a legitimate concern. We should look at those numbers and those proportions. But the disproportion in the Ottawa-Carleton area is far, far greater than in those other areas that have been cited.

1640

Certainly the idea of direct election of a regional chair makes a great deal of sense. I know there are many people in my region who think they should have the opportunity to directly elect that regional chair. I won't refute that.

Many of the reforms that are here are worth emulating elsewhere, but the fact that they are worth emulating elsewhere doesn't mean that they should be stopped here. In fact, we should look at these things, these excellent studies, the good work that's gone into this area. I think all of us, in all of our different regions, could learn something from this process, both that there is something here to emulate and that there's also a uniqueness in the Ottawa-Carleton area, a uniqueness that speaks to preserving those 11 municipalities, but not at the expense of some level of equity.

In their place, voters will have the opportunity of choosing local representatives and one of the new 18 regional councillors elected in their wards. Remember, we're talking about a larger say in the regional council, a direct accountability, but in fact a smaller number of regional councillors. There's a sense of that smaller

number being easier to manage as a council, more dedicated to the good work of promoting economic development within their region.

These regional councillors will have a loyalty above and beyond their local wards or their local areas; they'll be concerned also about that whole region. These regional councillors will have a regional perspective, more so than they do now, and certainly more so than is the case in many other areas. Many will come from wards which cross existing municipal boundaries and will have constituents from more than one city or more than one township.

Even though the regional wards are large, some geographically and some with large populations, I think they represent the best efforts—this is not a perfect world, but certainly the best efforts—of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and of the local clerks who work on the local committee which recommended those boundaries. This clerks' group worked with diligence by taking the report of Katherine Graham and improving upon it.

For example, the clerks from the eastern side of the region asked for and received some major alterations in the wards to allow for a better balance of the suburban and rural split on the east side of the river. Where cooperation was sought, it was, I believe, rewarded. The new regional council will have the same opportunity to review and change its ward boundaries, as all Ontario municipalities currently do, for the following municipal elections.

The Legislature of Ontario has the onerous task of providing people in Ontario with a good framework for municipal government. This task is difficult, because we do not elect local representatives, but we do determine local and regional structures. Provincial legislation will never provide perfect regional government. We don't pretend that to be the case, but we are pretending that we will be able to do all that we can. We will provide simpler, more accountable, more accessible and probably much better government.

It's quite an accomplishment, quite a long time coming, quite a great deal of work that's been involved in getting to this point, and I'm proud as a member of this government to support it.

I know that there is strong support for this bill in the region, such groups as the federation of community associations, the board of trade, elected representatives from across the region and most social service groups. They've been giving us one basic message repeatedly: They want us to pass this bill and to get it over with, to finish this process.

We have had support from significant members of all three political parties from all parts of that region. This is a bill that speaks to the needs of that region, that has the support of the majority of the people of that region. After the lengthy and hard work that's been involved, I think it deserves the support of this whole House. We have had the debate, we have had this process; I think it's time for us now to get on with it.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions or comments?

**Mr Daigeler:** Frankly, it almost makes me sick to my

stomach to hear a member from Durham Centre, and then the minister, who is from Etobicoke-Rexdale, telling us, the people who represent the Ottawa-Carleton area, how we feel and how the people of Ottawa-Carleton feel about this bill. Did you ever go to Ottawa-Carleton and speak to the people in Ottawa-Carleton, and I mean not just to Ottawa? Did you or the minister ever have the guts to come to Nepean and talk to the people of Nepean? Did you ever come out to Kanata? Did you ever go out to Gloucester? Did you ever go to any of the smaller rural municipalities?

*Interjection.*

**Mr Daigeler:** Yes, you have listened. You have listened to the member for Ottawa Centre. She represents downtown Ottawa, and she represents apparently the NDP view that tramples on the rights of the smaller municipalities.

You're talking about representation by population. I really did not think I was going to hear the NDP, which is supposed to defend the interests of the smaller people, adopt this approach in a way that's totally un-Canadian. If you apply these principles, we wouldn't have a Canada. Talk about Prince Edward Island. What's that in relationship, in terms of population, to the province of Ontario? Still we give them, and rightfully so, a proper place in the House of Commons, we give them a proper place in the Senate, because the Canadian way is to respect the minorities and to make sure that even the guy who is larger and bigger gives a chance to the guy who is smaller so that especially the rural municipalities and other municipalities can have their voice heard, and through consensus, not through coercion in the way you are trying to propose it. Shame on you, to hear that from the NDP.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further questions or comments.

**Mr Sterling:** Well, the member for Nepean took the words out of my mouth in terms of—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Sterling:** You should really not be diverted by the minister when he talks about the village of Rockcliffe and 2,500 population, because that's not in the equation. Kirby did not recommend that the mayor of Rockcliffe sit on regional council. Regional council did not recommend to the minister, after looking at the Kirby report, that the mayor of Rockcliffe sit on regional council. So the mayor of Rockcliffe, in terms of this discussion, is really irrelevant.

What you're talking about are people—the smallest population, when you take the village of Rockcliffe out, is about 14,000 people, and then you jump to places which have 14,000 to 20,000, and there's about six municipalities like that, and then there are a couple at 50,000 and then there are a couple at about 120,000. Those are the kinds of population figures.

If you want to sit down, I'd like to hear what the populations of the various sectors of Durham are. I'll bet you they're not much different than the kinds of population bases I'm talking about.

If in fact that's the case, if in fact your smallest municipality is 14,000 and you go up to larger municipal-

ities like Oshawa, which would be, what, 150,000 or 200,000, I believe all those mayors sit on regional councils, do they not? Well, then, let's do what's good for the goose is good for the gander.

**Mr White:** That's right.

**Mr Sterling:** Take all the mayors off Durham. Is that what you're recommending? I assume that's what you're recommending. That's what I would like to know. Is this government for taking mayors off all regional councils?

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** Something like that.

**Mr Sterling:** And Mr Cooper agrees. Thank you very much.

**Hon Mr Philip:** I want to congratulate the member on an excellent presentation that I think brought out a number of points: first of all, that this has been studied at great length, that two different governments had held studies, and that if there wasn't a problem, they wouldn't have spent all that money on those extensive studies; secondly, that it is now time to act and that in fact David Bartlett has said over and over again, at the time we announced and showed him the bill and indeed he said it on all of the media in Ottawa-Carleton, that if he had his report to do over again, he would have chosen the solution of taking the mayors off of the regional council in order to have a basic democratic system, which is representation by population.

1650

Some of the opposition members last week said: "Well, what about the Treasurer? He represents some 25,000 population and it's one vote." He also represents a geographical area of 40,000 square miles. There is no municipality, there is no ward under this system that is more than 50 kilometres from one end to the other, so to compare that to a 40,000-square-mile area of geography, or indeed if we get into the riding of Lake Nipigon where it's the size of what used to be West Germany, then one is simply raising a whole lot of red herrings.

The issue of funding has come up, and indeed there is transitional funding. We announced that there would be transitional funding immediately to study the communications costs. There are committees that are looking at what is needed in transitional funding, and it would be irresponsible of this government to announce a figure until those studies are in. But we have promised transitional funding; there will be transitional funding there. We're not going to throw money away without first of all knowing what the exact costs are.

**Mr Stockwell:** I just want to pick up on one rather interesting point. There seems to be some debate now with respect to rep by pop. The minister stands in his place and suggests the reason and the rationale for this kind of decision-making is representation by population. When the same applicable logic is applied to the provincial Legislature, the minister seems to suggest: "Don't bother me with representation by population. Don't argue with me about population. What comes into play at the provincial level is not rep by pop but rep by land mass." That appears to be the defence offered up by this minister when it comes to the boundaries of our own ridings.



With all due respect, there must be some consistency on that side of the House. Either you believe in representation by population or you don't. At this level, he doesn't. At the municipal level, he does.

The same arguments may be made, may I suggest, at the municipal level with respect to land mass and representation, and how much of an area a certain councillor or mayor-reeve may represent. If the argument can be made provincially, which seems to suit your purpose, why then will you not accept it at municipal level?

It seems that this minister speaks out of both sides of his mouth, depending on what election, what politician and what jurisdiction we're talking about. It's either rep by pop or it's not, and if it's rep by pop municipally, it should have the same consistent opinion provincially. We don't have it provincially. He said the Treasurer represents a huge land mass, but he won't take that into consideration at the local level.

I think the rep by pop is truly a red herring offered up by this minister, because if he truly believed it, he would see the Legislature very different today than it is.

**The Acting Speaker:** That completes questions and comments. The honourable member for Durham Centre has two minutes in response.

**Mr White:** I understand my colleague from Nepean's concern about shame. I'm sure he has difficulty when he looks at the dissonance in his own caucus about this bill, the way in which some members of caucus are on one side and some on the other.

The issue that my friend from Carleton mentions of equity, of fairness: Yes, he's right. This is a government that stands wholeheartedly behind principles of equity and fairness. He suggests that perhaps Durham region should similarly have some reform so that there's a greater representation, and I certainly wouldn't disagree with him on that score one little bit.

The issue of what area has the greatest inequity is an important one. If it happens to be Ottawa-Carleton, why, by Jiminy, perhaps that's the area we should start in terms of reform.

The issue proponents of inequity put forth is: "It's traditional. We've always had inequity. We've had inequity for the last 25 years in Ottawa-Carleton and we should continue to have it. We should always have a tradition like that." It's hard to change a boat as it's going down the stream.

Well, I think the time has come for us to change that, for us to offer the people of Ottawa-Carleton greater equity, greater fairness, simplicity, greater accountability and more effectiveness in terms of their government. Those are issues this government stands wholeheartedly behind.

I know my friend would like to see a preservation of inequity in his region, but I'm not sure—in fact, we know the people of his region clearly want to have reform that is responsive to what they need, not just those needs of a minority.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** I begin by holding in my hand the letter written to the electorate and

potential candidates for municipal office in Ottawa-Carleton.

**Mr Daigeler:** And it's very close to contempt of the Legislature.

**Mrs O'Neill:** A letter that today has been described by our Speaker as close to contempt. This letter was placed as a full-page advertisement in local daily and weekly papers in February of this year, and I ask, at what cost to the Ontario taxpayer?

In this open letter, the minister thanks the citizens of Ottawa-Carleton for their active participation in discussions. The minister seems to be—I repeat seems to be—attempting to make the people of Ottawa-Carleton believe they had an opportunity, a real opportunity, to participate in the discussions of Bill 77 or, as we now call it, Bill 143, with which we are dealing.

The minister, in this expensive letter, paid for by the taxpayer, indicated that he would amend Bill 77. Bill 143 is much more than an amendment to Bill 77. It is, as you know, an entirely new bill. This ad, this letter, are hypocrisy—I repeat: hypocrisy. The minister says, in both his infamous letter and in some of his remarks, "Both candidates and officials will have adequate time to prepare for this year's elections." That is the minister's opinion.

Perhaps, in the best-case scenario, some candidates will have adequate time but I ask, and I consider it important, will the electorate of Ottawa-Carleton be given an opportunity to identify the changes which will determine who will represent them, and will officials be able to implement this bill, not yet passed, in an efficient manner? Will the electorate have due time to familiarize themselves with new boundaries that determine the councillors they will elect, both regionally and locally?

Bill 143 now envelops the school boards of Ottawa-Carleton, which were never consulted about their inclusion in this broad-brush legislation. A golden opportunity passed in the fall of 1993 in the Bourns report, and these discussions could have been included at that time. With tongue in cheek, I note that the minister is guaranteeing us, the residents of Ottawa-Carleton, that the bill will be law well in advance of the closing date for nominations; again I remind you, close to contempt.

Why is Ottawa-Carleton being singled out as we approach the municipal and school board elections of 1994? Bill 143 addresses the difficult transition period for this legislation. In subsection 27(1) the bill states, "Despite this or any other act, the minister may, by regulation, provide for transitional matters which, in the opinion of the minister, are necessary or expedient to conduct the 1994 regular elections...in...Ottawa-Carleton."

What uncertainty, what centralization, what lack of consideration. "Despite this or any other act": The jack-boot minister is in a hurry. The minister, by order, is to determine the number of regional wards, the date for the boundary decisions as well as the boundaries of regional wards and local wards, and perhaps most insulting of all, the minister has given himself the power to determine the name or number of each regional or local ward.

1700

Are we talking about increasing ministerial powers or

are we speaking about a more responsive and responsible government for Ottawa-Carleton? That's the question.

After all those decisions are made by this very busy minister, and after the 1994 municipal election is over, the OMB, in making future decisions on governance in Ottawa-Carleton, is to be governed by the following principles: the presence or absence of a community of interest, topographical features, special geographical considerations. But these principles are not going to be guaranteed for the 1994 election, certainly not, and we can give you some very good examples.

"Insensitive" is the kindest word I can think of to describe the way in which Ottawa-Carleton is being asked to lockstep into whatever idea the minister has on any given day about what is "necessary or expedient" for the people of Ottawa-Carleton. We continue to hear "in the opinion of the minister," but the opportunity for the people of Ottawa-Carleton to present their opinions is visibly absent from the discussions.

In my opinion, the short time frames, the confusion which surrounds this legislation and the transition period leading up to its implementation are extremely unfair to the people whose daily lives will be affected by it. Now we're at the 11th hour. Not only were the ratepayers of Ottawa-Carleton not included when they could have been under the original Bill 77, but now, less than six months before the close of nominations for the 1994 municipal elections, they are being presented with a new bill. What is the hurry? What is the real agenda?

I have to ask what specific knowledge of the concerns of Ottawa-Carleton the minister will be using to determine his opinion on the necessities or expediencies as described by this bill. The minister has made but one brief visit to Ottawa-Carleton. In the summer of 1993, on the very day he was introducing Bill 77 in this House, he came for but a short visit. Since that time, there has been no response to numerous requests for further meetings by the citizens of Ottawa-Carleton; no response to requests for hearings that have come from citizens or members of this Legislature; no response to requests for a referendum. In fact, many citizens of Ottawa-Carleton believe the minister does not want to consult with the public on this issue.

Citizens for Good Government, a group which represents various community organizations from across the whole region of Ottawa-Carleton, believes that Bill 143 "is not reflective of the best interests of our community. It should not be forgotten that this echo comes from the east, from the west and from the south, and from several pockets of Ottawa" itself.

To reinforce the unresponsiveness of the minister to this very important issue, the corporation of the township of West Carleton and the corporation of the city of Nepean have recently passed resolutions which state that the Minister of Municipal Affairs "refuses to discuss or negotiate alterations to Bill 77," "has ignored the recommendations of all of [his] own consultants," "has ignored studies indicating the increased costs," and "he intend[s] to introduce some changes... but does not intend to provide details." Those were recent meetings of councils affected. I ask, is this what this minister and the govern-

ment he represents consider as adequate consultation?

The Residents' Association of Nepean, a community of Carleton Heights, said in a letter to the minister recently: "We do not believe that Bill 77 reflects what the majority of people in this area said to Mr Kirby when there were local consultations. Where is your mandate to make such radical changes to local governments which are working very well?"

The board of trustees of Nepean Museum "has serious concerns with regard to the impact this bill will have on local government and specifically with respect to local autonomy, political representation, financial accountability and police services," pretty important issues in our community.

As my colleague the member for Ottawa East said in his remarks last Thursday, Citizens for Good Government note that: "Mr Philip states that Bill 77 is based upon the Kirby report. The Kirby report does not recommend the restructuring of local government in the Ottawa-Carleton area at this time, nor does he suggest that lower-tier representation be removed from regional council. Mr Philip's legislation is in conflict with the very report he commissioned."

The minister does not realize, or perhaps he does, that he is ignoring tradition, ignoring history and ignoring local governments, which have a 76% satisfaction rating as determined by Coopers and Lybrand in its studies as prepared for the Kirby report. Without local input, without local ownership, once again, the NDP commitment to open, accessible and accountable government is left seriously wanting.

In debating Bill 143 we ask ourselves a fundamental question: When in Canadian history have changes to municipal electoral boundaries and government restructuring been made within the same year as a municipal election, let alone within six months or less than six months to the call of the election?

Even as late as last month the minister himself stated, "I will be releasing further details on the 1994 election process in Ottawa-Carleton once Bill 77 receives royal assent." Imagine, we have to wait for royal assent to know the details of Bill 143, or Bill 77, which will fundamentally change ward boundaries, representation, communities of interest and natural community groupings.

Yet the minister will not take responsibility for his own delays. To quote again from the minister's famous full-page ad, "I'm calling on the opposition members of the Legislature to cooperate in seeing that this legislation is implemented."

You know and I know and everyone else knows that the bottom line is that if this legislation were a government priority, it would have passed last December. It would be law now, and the people of Ottawa-Carleton would not now, just six months before a municipal election, be presented with retroactive solutions, new ward boundaries and mountains and mountains of confusion.

I turn now to the issue of removing the mayors unilaterally from regional government, a major issue in



this debate. In a letter to the minister dated September 14, 1993, the mayor of the city of Gloucester says, "Without the mayors, regional council will not be accountable to nor representative of the local municipal corporations, as the mayors are CEOs of the corporations."

The mayor of West Carleton presents his case, "At no time during the public meetings with Mr Kirby did our ratepayers support removal of the mayors from regional government." In fact, in his report he stressed the importance of the continuation of the mayors on regional council, as did Graham and Bartlett before him.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities has told this group of mayors, "There is no county, region or district council anywhere in Canada which does not have mayors sitting on it."

Bill 143 provides no direct link between regional government and local municipalities. This is indeed a major, major change, and I consider it a major, major error and weakness, a major change in accountability, a major change in cost controls, a major change in equitable distribution of economic development across the municipalities, a major shift in our community and its patterns, traditions and history.

A councillor of Ottawa asks, "Is it not ironic that after a tumultuous social contract year in 1993 the NDP government can justify an additional \$1.8-million expenditure?"

It's generally accepted that the new cost of regional councillors and their increased staff complement will add to the tax burden. There is certainly no proof that there will be a better level of accountability. There is no proof that this reform, so-called, will result in more efficient government or that the quality of government will improve in Ottawa-Carleton.

1710

Toronto city council at its December 13 and 14, 1993, meeting added its voice to the growing number of municipal bodies expressing serious concerns about the ramifications of Bill 143. At that meeting Toronto city council requested the Minister of Municipal Affairs to withdraw the bill.

On August 5, 1993, the president of AMO wrote to the minister "to express the association's grave concerns regarding the manner in which the province is proceeding with the reforms to regional government in Ottawa-Carleton," saying that, "AMO opposes any proposed upper-tier reform legislation which excludes the heads of councils from voting representation on the upper-tier council unless requested by local municipalities."

The president of AMO went on to say: "In the past, the province has consistently indicated that it has no intention of forcing reform on municipalities. Yet in the case of Ottawa-Carleton, the province has announced that it intends to proceed with a significant package of reforms, apparently without regard for the local level of support for those reforms."

That is the action of the NDP government. This new legislation confirms the worst fears of all of these people. It vests the real power in the hands of the regional level of government, and I quote from the bill,

"The regional council of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton may pass bylaws exercising its authority...with respect to works owned or operated by or on behalf of any person including an area municipality or local board thereof as if the works were regional works." How all-encompassing this may become is anyone's guess.

This bill goes on to stipulate in subsection 84.1(2): "The regional council...may pass bylaws regulating the design, construction, operation and maintenance of works owned or operated by or on behalf of any person, including an area municipality or local board thereof."

These are but examples of the kind of centralized power that this bill represents. Elected representatives and many, many of their taxpayers at the local level fear that their ability to serve the communities which elected them will be seriously eroded by this centralization of power and authority.

Another area of great interest surrounding Bill 143 is that regional wards will, for the first time in Ottawa-Carleton, cross municipal boundaries. But it's more important to note also that Bill 143 suspends local councils' legislative right to develop local ward boundaries. Nowhere else in Ontario has any council been denied this legislative entitlement.

This initiative ignored natural boundaries, community identities and traditional communities of interest. The establishment of ward boundaries has now become a totally Queen's Park solution. Candidates who have already registered to stand for a particular office will now be permitted or required to register for a new office yet to be created by this bill.

Is this responsible government, I ask? Is this better government, I ask? Is this fair to the people of Ottawa-Carleton? The suspension of statutory rights to establish ward boundaries, the destruction of the vital link between regional and local government, the absence of municipal control over costs which will impact on residents: Many, many people in my community are asking why and why now of Bill 143.

We, not one of us in Ottawa-Carleton, have access to any definitive data on tax implications or on the cost of Bill 143. Tax implications or cost are very important issues in a decision of this magnitude. No doubt we're just expected again to take one giant leap of faith in this NDP government.

A group called the Citizens for Fair Taxes sent a letter to the Premier on September 26, 1993, reporting on the results of a public meeting they held to examine some of the implications of Bill 77. They told the Premier,

"It was the consensus of the meeting...to formally request that you withhold further reading of this bill until the full net costs and tax implications have been clarified and regional taxpayers," the people who foot the bill, "have been consulted."

A rather reasonable request, wouldn't you think, Mr Speaker? But not one public hearing or public meeting has been provided by this NDP government as this made-in-Toronto solution, first Bill 77, now Bill 143, is to be imposed on us.

There is no convincing evidence that we will see better government, no guarantees that the administrative bureaucracy will not enlarge and certainly there is no guarantee that performance will be improved or that costs and taxes will be reduced.

As I mentioned earlier, Bill 143 adds school boards, and the French-language school board in particular, to an already complex piece of legislation. Although the changes to the French-language school board are what our constituents requested, the major trouble of trusteeship in the French-language school board, the major problem of trusteeship, the inability of a board duly elected to represent its constituents, is not even mentioned in this legislation, nor is the deficit question, that is becoming much, much broader-based, solution to be found in this legislation; again, no mention. Many people in our community are very concerned on these two matters, and indeed, they consider them constitutional matters Bill 143 ignores.

This bill, as described by a prominent member of our local chamber of commerce, results in a more centralized, a more formal, a more distant, a less accessible, much larger and perhaps less accountable government, a government further removed from its people.

As I close, I ask again, where is the widespread support for this bill that the minister continues to talk about? My correspondence, which continues to increase, tracks just the opposite.

I would urge this government and especially the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the member for Ottawa Centre to rethink their position. Listen to the people of Ottawa-Carleton. Give all of the people of Ottawa-Carleton a real chance to express themselves on Bill 143. We must have public hearings in Ottawa-Carleton. The democratic process demands no less. Municipalities right across this province are requesting public hearings on this bill.

Ontario is watching. AMO is watching. The people of Ontario are watching. Democracy must be served. We must have the ability to hear the voices of the people of Ottawa-Carleton on this bill that is going to affect them so greatly.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Thank you to the member for Ottawa-Rideau. Questions and/or comments? The member for Don Mills.

**Mr David Johnson:** I'd like to congratulate the member for Ottawa-Rideau, particularly with regard to the finish. I think that's the important aspect here. I would urge the minister and the government members to listen to this—the aspect of having a public hearing. The municipal government is the most important government to most people. It delivers the grass-roots services that people need, and consequently it's of supreme importance to them.

If we're going to set in place through this Legislature a new form of municipal government, then it is most important that it be debated, discussed, with the local people to make sure there is the support, because I've found—and I think I'm hearing from the back benches, “How many more discussions or how many more debates

do we have?” We've had reports but we haven't had—and this has been pointed out time and time again here this afternoon even—a public hearing with the people on this proposal, in particular the aspect of leaving the mayors off the regional council, destroying that linkage that exists all across the rest of this province. In all other cases municipal councils have that linkage with the regional council—they have the mayors on the regional council, they have reeves, or some form of representation—and here is a first.

**1720**

Now, does it not behoove us to discuss this, to understand the ramifications? It's not without reason that the linkage is there. That linkage supplies the communication between the region and the local governments so that they work together closely for the most important services of the people. The member is saying we need to have that discussion with the people of Ottawa-Carleton, and I hope that can be achieved.

**Mr White:** I recall earlier this afternoon when there was an announcement about a resolution of a very important labour dispute in our province, good news for the people of Ontario, a guarantee of security of the power and the efficiencies that they have been looking for.

When I looked opposite, did I see members pleased, smiling, clapping, standing? No. They were uniformly glum; glum because the province of Ontario's economic safety and security was guaranteed by the efficient operation of this government. That efficiency, the accessibility, the accountability, is a hallmark of our government, and uniformly the members opposite in the official opposition have been opposed to the reforms that the people of Ottawa-Carleton have in turn again and again requested. I think the issues of accountability, of efficiency, of fairness and equity are things which our party and our government understand full well.

My friend from Ottawa-Rideau spoke of consultation. We have heard for years—how many reports?—from Mayo, from Bartlett, from Graham, from Kirby, from Bourns, all of these extensive, expensive reports, all of this extensive consultation. On the one hand my friend would say we haven't had enough consultation, and then in the next breath I'm sure she will tell us that far too much money has been spent on this consultation.

The people of Ottawa-Rideau have been consulted. They want to see action, they want to see efficiencies. Just as the people of Ontario are pleased that hydro and power is guaranteed to them by the good workings of our government, so do the people of Ottawa-Carleton want more efficient and accessible government.

**Mr Daigeler:** I just want to say very briefly in reaction to what the member for Ottawa-Rideau said that she started out by pointing out what the NDP concept of fairness and equity is, of which the member for Durham Centre speaks so proudly. Well, we heard that today by the ruling of the Speaker, and the member for Ottawa-Rideau made clear reference to that.

Here's what the Speaker said: “...I want to say to the minister that this action”—and that's the information that the minister put out in a \$10,000 advertising campaign to



the people of Ottawa-Carleton—"has come very close to contempt, and in the future the minister should exercise more caution and exhibit greater respect for the proprieties of this House."

This is the Speaker; this is not me. This is the Speaker of this Legislature. That's what he's saying about the actions of this government and about the actions of this minister. If the minister had any integrity he would have stood up today and would have apologized for saying what he did in this particular ad. His assistant is falling for the line that the minister has given to him and that the Minister of Housing, the member for Ottawa Centre, also has given to him: that the people of Ottawa-Carleton are in favour. They're not. The people of Ottawa may be in favour, and even of those not all of them.

The member for Ottawa Centre is in favour, yes, because I guess she figured out that to get re-elected perhaps that's the only chance to get the people from Ottawa Centre behind her. Well, I can tell you, the people from Nepean—and I'll put that on the record as soon as I get an opportunity—the people from Kanata, the people from Gloucester, the people from Cumberland, and so on and so on are not in favour. If you had at least looked at your correspondence and if the minister had looked at his correspondence, he would never have issued the ad he put forward.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired. Further questions or comments? The member for Brant-Haldimand.

**Hon Mr Philip:** Are we not rotating?

**The Acting Speaker:** Excuse me. Yes, the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**Hon Mr Philip:** The member for Ottawa-Rideau gives the impression that only mayors can represent local government on the upper tier. Well, we have a county system where a majority of counties, with one exception I can think of, do not have mayors on the upper tier.

The thrust of her statement was that somehow people who believe in this legislation, who believe in the thrust we are taking, are not listening to the people of Ottawa-Carleton. If that is the case, I guess Dalton McGuinty, the member for Ottawa South, a Liberal member, and indeed Mr Chiarelli, another member of the Liberal Party, have clearly come out in their press release and indeed have said so publicly, as late as, in the case of Mr McGuinty, in meetings this week, that they are in support of the bill. If members of this government are not listening to the people of Ottawa-Carleton, there are two members on that side of the House.

The Liberal Party likes to have it both ways. They like to have three different positions on a bill so that each of them can go to different parts of the province and say, "We're on your side, people; we're going to do what you want," and then you go over a few miles away and there's another Liberal member saying: "That may be the position, but I'm really on your side. I believe in this."

What we're talking about is fairness. We're talking about fairness for the people in Ottawa-Carleton, a majority of whom are paying for policing and cannot understand why a municipality next to them, a municipal-

ity that may have twice the population, in fact is not paying a cent. That's fairness. Obviously, the Liberal Party doesn't believe in fairness; they don't believe in equalization when it comes to taxation. Neither does the Conservative Party, that of course historically has always stood for vested interests in this province.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Ottawa-Rideau has two minutes to respond.

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: Do we not have time for another speaker? We've been having more—

**The Acting Speaker:** We have had four questions and/or comments and now the original speaker has two minutes to respond.

**Mr Eddy:** I just wanted to ask the minister to withdraw those remarks about the Liberal Party, if he would.

**Mrs O'Neill:** If the minister's party, the NDP, had more than one member from Ottawa-Carleton, he might find that not every member from Ottawa-Carleton agreed with him, but he doesn't have that situation.

As far as I know, neither the member for Ottawa West nor the member for Ottawa South have spoken on Bill 143 in this House, so we will wait to see what they say.

I also must correct the member from Durham when he suggests that I did not respond to the settlement for Hydro in this province today. The settlement was reached beyond the floor of this Legislature, and I respond that we will now be able to continue the service to the people of Ontario.

My points today are based on some fundamental principles, that there is no community of ownership across the whole of Ottawa-Carleton for this bill. I happen to represent a riding that bridges three cities in this particular jurisdiction: Ottawa, Nepean and Gloucester. Members of my Ottawa community certainly are having some difficulties with boundaries of some of the wards that have been assigned to them. If Mr Philip, the minister, would read some of the local newspapers, he would see that people do not agree totally with what he is suggesting.

The main concern of the people of Ottawa-Carleton, if I may suggest, is the indeterminate cost of this bill. We have no idea how much the councillors are going to be paid, for starters. We have no idea what kind of office and staff they're going to have. We have no idea of what the transitional fees are going to be, except perhaps some broad idea of what regional policing is going to entail, but even there things are pretty, pretty foggy.

The school boards have been thrown in, and, as I suggest, the major problems have not been addressed.

1730

**The Acting Speaker:** We have further debate with regard to Bill 143. The member for Don Mills has the floor.

**Mr David Johnson:** Today, people in Ontario are demanding government that is more efficient, more effective, more accountable, less wasteful, less complicated and less intrusive into their lives. I believe that government services can be provided in a cost-efficient

and an accessible manner by the government that, first, is capable of delivering those services but, second, is closest to the people of the province of Ontario. Consequently, I feel that those services should be delivered as far as possible by local councils. What we should be doing in this Legislature is strengthening local councils and promoting strong local government to ensure a solid and cooperative working relationship at the municipal level. Sadly, I must say that Bill 143 fails to do that.

*Interjections.*

**Mr David Johnson:** I can hear the catcalling from the other side of the Legislature. I think that's the sign of a guilty conscience.

Bill 143 fails through the process, and we have been talking about the process here this afternoon on many occasions. Many speakers have alluded to the fact that the people of Ottawa-Carleton haven't had an opportunity to debate some of the most serious aspects of this bill. I know the government is fond of saying there has been a number of studies: the Kirby study, the Graham study, the Bartlett study. All these studies have taken place over the last half a dozen years or so, but the fact remains that some of the key recommendations before us today in Bill 143 have not been taken to the people of Ottawa-Carleton; recommendations such as leaving the mayors off the regional council, destroying that traditional linkage that has existed here in the province, that has existed in the Ottawa-Carleton region, that has existed across Canada, that linkage with regional governments.

The minister says that not all regional governments have mayors on the regional council, but that's semantics, because there is strong representation everywhere else in Ontario on the regional councils, whether it's through reeves, deputy reeves or mayors. That is a fact. I'm sure the minister would have to acknowledge that.

So the process up to this point has not been thorough, it's not been satisfactory, it hasn't involved the people whose lives are going to be most affected. The member for Nepean has asked: Has the minister been to Ottawa-Carleton? Has the minister talked to the people?

**Mr Daigeler:** He's been to Ottawa but never to Nepean.

**Mr David Johnson:** Has he been to Nepean? The answer is no. Has he been to Kanata? I don't know. Perhaps the minister will respond to this.

**Mr Daigeler:** He hasn't.

**Mr David Johnson:** I'm told that no, he hasn't; he hasn't talked to the people in Kanata, he hasn't talked to the people in Nepean. I wonder if he's talked to the people in Cumberland.

**Mr George Dadamo (Windsor-Sandwich):** We live in Canada.

**Mr David Johnson:** We live in Kanata? Has the minister been to Kanata, a thriving city of over 100,000 people?

**Mr Daigeler:** What about Osgoode? Has he been to Stittsville?

**Mr David Johnson:** Stittsville, which I understand is going to be cut in two by a boundary—

**Mr Daigeler:** Smack down the middle of the city.

**Mr David Johnson:** —smack down the middle of Stittsville. The proposal is that a riding boundary go smack down the middle of Stittsville and split the community in two. Has he been to Stittsville to talk to the people of Stittsville? I can tell by his inattention that he hasn't.

**Mr Daigeler:** He doesn't care about the people.

**Mr David Johnson:** The member for Nepean says, "He doesn't care about the people." I hope that's not true, Minister. You're being accused of not caring about the people. But if we don't take this very important legislation to the people and talk to them about it and get their views, those kinds of accusations will come up. Perhaps the best way to address that is to take the committee work into the region, to go into Kanata and to go into Nepean and to go into all of these 11 municipalities and have a good discussion with them. But I think I'm whistling in the breeze, as they say. I don't think that's going to happen. They'll be very disappointed.

Secondly, we have seen a very recent revision that has renumbered this bill from Bill 77 to Bill 143 to permit the division of the French public school system from the French separate school system in terms of having two different boards and two different structures all the way up. I must say that's come up within the last couple of weeks. The official announcement I guess was within the last week. Hardly anybody has any input on that.

The basic information that I have is that in fact this may be a positive move, but it's rather a comment on the state of affairs of this whole bill that we have last-minute changes. The minister was hoping to ram this through last year. Had he done that, of course, then the French school system wouldn't be before us today. But since cooler heads prevailed, this issue is before us. But still, there's been no feedback on it, no opportunity for debate.

Thirdly, the main problem with this bill involves the actual recommendations, and that's where I'll be spending most of my time. The structure that's being set up is just not satisfactory to the majority of the people, a majority of the municipalities. There's tremendous opposition to what is being proposed by the minister. I know that the member for Durham Centre is a good party member and he has outlined some of the support that's here.

**Mr Daigeler:** He's the parliamentary assistant; he has to do it.

**Mr David Johnson:** A good parliamentary assistant, I'm reminded by the member for Nepean.

**Mr Daigeler:** That's what he gets paid for.

**Mr David Johnson:** He's paid for this, the member for Nepean says, and he's done his job in an excellent fashion. But the truth is that there's far more opposition to this bill, and it has been alluded to here today. I'll just remind the member for Durham Centre of the opposition, and I'll remind the minister too now, because I sense he's looking.

First, there is the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. It passed a resolution. I read the resolution. It says, "The Association of Municipalities of Ontario opposes any proposed upper-tier reform legislation which



excludes the heads of council"—in this case the mayors—"from voting representation on the upper-tier council, unless requested by the local municipalities." I can assure you that the local municipalities have certainly not requested that course of action.

There we have the Association of Municipalities of Ontario asking that this not be proceeded with. Mind you, this is not the first instance within the last short period of time that this provincial government has ignored the position of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. That association, I suspect, is becoming rather concerned that it represents so many people, such a huge percentage—I think about 90% of the province of Ontario is represented through its members, if I recall accurately—and yet two key issues within the last short period of time have been rejected by this government: the bill that's before us today, Bill 143, and Bill 120, which was debated here this afternoon.

The association of municipalities has told this government time and time again, as has each and every municipality, including in this case the city of Ottawa, I might add, that this government is going in the wrong direction on Bill 120. But this government does not heed the advice of municipalities. This government is not heeding the advice of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario.

In addition, I'm pleased to say that both of the municipalities that I represent—the city of North York and the city of East York—are on record as saying that this structure of government, this fact of leaving the mayors off the regional government, is the wrong way to go. Both East York and North York are opposed. Etobicoke is opposed. Scarborough is opposed. Uxbridge is opposed. Belleville and Fort Erie are opposed. All of these municipalities are opposed.

Since I have the attention of the member for Durham Centre, I won't read all of these, but I will say that the town of Newcastle is opposed, Ajax, Fort Erie—I think I mentioned Fort Erie before—Aurora, Orillia, Richmond Hill, Grimsby, Sault Ste Marie.

1740

**Hon Mr Philip:** Give us a break.

**Mr David Johnson:** This opposition, Minister, is straight across the province of Ontario.

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** Wellington county's opposed.

**Mr David Johnson:** Wellington county's opposed, Brampton, St Catharines, Timmins, Woodstock. The minister says give him a break, that these municipalities are not opposed. There are records. There are letters on file, records on file.

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** They didn't know what they were voting for.

**Mr David Johnson:** The member for Durham West says the municipalities did not know what they were voting for. That is typical of the approach of this government to municipalities: They do not know what they're doing, municipalities who, I might say to the member for Durham West, if you take a poll of the people of the province of Ontario—and I've seen these polls on many

occasions—their opinion of who provides the best government, the most efficient government, the government that they're happiest with, it is easily the local councils, the councils that I've just read out, the councils that you say don't know what they're voting for.

Those are the governments in this country that people are happiest with and feel they get their best value from. But you don't think they know what they're talking about. I can tell you, they know what's going on. The local governments know what's going on. They know what they're voting for. They know better than anybody else.

*Interjection.*

**Mr David Johnson:** I might add to the member, who's somewhat exercised by this revelation, that the provincial government is well down that same satisfaction list, below—

**Mr White:** A lot higher than the federal government, my friend.

**Mr David Johnson:** Yes, higher than the federal government, I'll give it to the member for Durham Centre. That's some comparison, but there you are. You're higher than the federal government, just barely, but you are higher than the federal government. But you are below all the municipal governments and all the regional governments. Those are the governments that people are happy with.

So listen to these governments. Listen to what they're saying. They have the ear of the people, they represent the people, and this is the government where you are putting in place a structure and it's going to be harmful, and that's what they're saying to you.

So where does the support come from? It doesn't even come from Ottawa-Carleton itself, the region itself. The region of Ottawa-Carleton itself, the region that through this bill we're giving more—I have here in my hand—

**Mr Wiseman:** The mayor of Ottawa—

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr David Johnson:** I'm going to have to say to the member for Durham West—

**Mr Wiseman:** Centre.

**Mr David Johnson:** Durham Centre. I wish you two wouldn't sit together. I'm going to have to say to the member for Durham Centre, there is a distinction between Ottawa-Carleton region and the city of Ottawa. They're two different governments.

**Mr Daigeler:** You better say that again. They have a hard time understanding that.

**Mr David Johnson:** The member for Nepean says they don't understand that. I believe he does. I believe he understands that.

The region of Ottawa-Carleton, in recommendation 11, says that in the makeup of the council, it is recommended that the size of the new regional council should be 29 members, and those 29 members should be the 18 councillors directly elected, yes. But in addition the 10 local area mayors should be on there as well, excluding the mayor from Rockcliffe Park. The 10 mayors should be on. That's what the region says itself. This is the level

of government we are trying to accommodate, and they want the mayors on themselves.

There is so much opposition to this, I wondered who was actually in support. We've heard a list of about I think, what, half a dozen—well, Ottawa itself and—

**Mr Arnott:** Evelyn Gigantes.

**Mr David Johnson:** Evelyn Gigantes—the member for Ottawa Centre, I should say—and about a half a dozen other people or organizations.

I requested the Ministry of Municipal Affairs: "Please send to me all the letters in support of this new proposal. Would you send them to me? I would like to be aware of them." Do you know what response I got? "Sorry, it's confidential. We can't give you that information. It's confidential." Now, what would be confidential in letters in support of the government's proposal? That boggles my mind. I don't know. So we put in for a freedom of information, and hopefully that information will come.

My suspicion, though, I might say, is that there is some embarrassment that there really is very little support on record for this proposal, and that's what the government is concerned about divulging.

**Mr White:** I've always thought you were a suspicious man.

**Mr David Johnson:** You can say I'm a suspicious man. I'm going to read you an article from the Municipal Monitor. This is an article in the February-March edition of this year, 1994, a very, very recent article. If I was a suspicious person, this is what I would think. This article in the Municipal Monitor says: "One of the most frightening things about this legislation is the popular belief that the province wants one-tier government but lacks the political will to implement it. As a result, they have created a hybrid which is so unworkable the electorate will get frustrated and demand one-tier government."

**Mr White:** How old is that?

**Mr David Johnson:** February-March 1994, very current, Municipal Monitor. Look it up. Here it is.

I ask the government, is that what's behind this? I hope not, because if it is, I might say that one-tier government has been tried in Canada.

**Mr Wiseman:** I'm just trying to sort out what you're thinking.

**Mr David Johnson:** The member for Durham West has, I think, said that one-tier government's less costly.

**Mr Wiseman:** I didn't say that. I tried to figure out what you're trying to say.

**Mr David Johnson:** What I'm trying to say—

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. Your remarks should be directed through the Chair. Thank you.

**Mr David Johnson:** Through the Chair, Madam Speaker, there is a suspicion, since this form of government makes so little sense without having the linkage between the regional council and the local council, those mayors who will make this level of government work, that there's another agenda here, and the other agenda is to bring in one-tier government in Ottawa-Carleton.

If that's so, then I'm most disappointed. I might simply

and quickly point out the example in Winnipeg where that was tried many years ago. Three decades ago, there was a similar proposal structure to what's being suggested here by the current government. It was put in place. It was such a failure. There was so much of conflict between the regional government and the local government at that time, because there was no linkage, there was no communication back and forth, that finally unicity was implemented and they now have one level of government, one unicity in the city of Winnipeg. If that's what they want, then they're headed in the right direction.

But I might say that every report that I've got says that the unicity concept is a very expensive model, and indeed we have a Price Waterhouse report which analysed the region of Ottawa-Carleton and came to that exact conclusion, that if there was a unicity model implemented in the Ottawa-Carleton region, it would be considerably more expensive, somewhere in the vicinity of 15% more on municipal taxes. If that's where they're headed, that's what they'll get.

I'm responding again to the government's suggestion that people are not supportive of the present system, and I quote from the Ottawa Citizens for Good Government. Through the Kirby report, I guess it was, there was some analysis done. Actually, it was done by Coopers and Lybrand for the Kirby commission. They found that the net satisfaction with local councils to be 76%, that 76% of the local people felt that the 11 local councils in the Ottawa-Carleton region were doing a good job, while 57% thought the regional council is doing a good job. I might add that if they had done the provincial government, it would be considerably lower than that again.

1750

Actually, the Ottawa Citizens for Good Government made a couple of good points, and I'll just quickly go through some of them while I have their brief before me. The asked a question, a question that I hope the members take seriously: "When in Canadian history have changes to electoral boundaries and government restructure been within the same year as an election, let alone within the same six months?" That's what we've got; we've got six months. By the time this is put in place, there'll be less than six months until the start of the municipal election.

The say: "The changes to the ward boundaries as they are presented" through this bill "destroy all level of community of interest," and they mention the town of Stittsville where, as it was indicated earlier, the boundary goes right down the main street. "Currently, municipalities establish their own local boundaries based on the needs of the community. This legislation will create regional wards which cross municipal boundaries."

These are some of the concerns of the people associated with the Citizens for Good Government in Ottawa.

Just one more I'll bring to your attention. They say that if the cost of government was to increase as a result of a move to a one-tier government—and as I mentioned earlier, I have a suspicion that's where this is really headed—then 81% of the people would be opposed to the changes. Some 81% of the people oppose changes that will bring in higher costs to the government.



I'm going to spend just a few minutes on the issue of the mayors on the regional council. There have been a number of studies; as has been mentioned here already, the Kirby report. The Kirby report was reported on in 1992; it came forward. Being the most recent report, what did it say about the mayors being on the regional council? That seems to be the number one issue here.

There are other issues—I may not get a chance to get to the other issues—involving policing costs, involving the cost of services such as storm sewers and that sort of thing, but I think we're going to find that the main issue is the cross-representation from the local council to the regional council.

I'm reading from a report from the mayor of the city of Gloucester to the minister, and the mayor of Gloucester says, "The most recent report on regional government in Ottawa-Carleton, conducted by Graeme Kirby in 1992, stressed that without local mayors on regional council there would be a lack of formal linkages between the two levels, which could possibly weaken cooperation and coordination between them."

So there we have the most recent report from the mayor of Gloucester, saying that you must have the mayors on the regional council to make it work.

What about the Graham report, which occurred two years earlier, in 1990? The Graham report suggested that the mayors should be on the regional council.

Let's go back one before that again. The one before that again is the Bartlett report. The minister is fond of saying now that Commissioner Bartlett has had a change of mind and that now Commissioner Bartlett says that the mayors shouldn't be on the regional council. This is a new revelation today, that the mayors shouldn't be on the regional council.

However, I can only take from the words of the Bartlett report itself, and the Bartlett report says: "No matter how the other councillors are elected, it is essential that the 11 mayors of the area municipalities continue to serve on the regional council. The mayors are required as representatives of the corporate components of the regional system—the municipalities as such—rather than as direct representatives of the electorate."

I think that comment is important, because the minister is fond of saying that we cannot have the mayors on the regional council because it will destroy representation by population and representation by population is so important to us. Of course, we have determined earlier today that it's important that we have representation by population at the municipal level, but apparently it's not important that we have representation by population at the provincial level.

We've heard the statistics at the provincial level; for example Nickel Belt, represented by the Minister of Finance, has some 37,000 people, whereas Markham, represented by the honourable member Don Cousens, my good friend just in front of me, has a population now of about 140,000 people—

**Mr Cousens:** One hundred and sixty thousand.

**Mr David Johnson:** Sorry, 160,000 people in the riding of Markham and the Finance minister has less than

40,000 people. There's a factor of four to one. Do I see the minister standing up today saying that's wrong, that we must address that? Do I see the parliamentary assistant saying that's wrong, that we must address it? There's a difference of four to one.

What I see is the minister saying, "That's okay, because there what's most important is representation by square kilometre." The riding of Nickel Belt is big, so we don't put any importance on representation by population but on representation by square kilometre.

What is being said here is that it's not just the aspect of the numbers game. The mayors have a role to play on regional government in terms of bringing the issues from the local council to the regional council, issues of planning, transportation, labour relations, all sorts of issues that need to be communicated back and forth between those two levels of government.

One other aspect we've heard from this government is the issue that the mayors are parochial, that if the mayors come to the regional council they bring forward parochial deals.

*Interjection.*

**Mr David Johnson:** I see again my good friend the member for Durham Centre trying to express himself on this, but I'm sure he would agree with me that what some people may consider to be parochial, other people may consider to be responsive and being accountable. Having the mayors on the regional council brings that accountability, that responsiveness to the regional council. The mayors live in their communities. They're there all the time and, whether we like it or not, the people look to the mayors for that kind of leadership and that kind of responsiveness, and if they really want an issue resolved, that's where they go. That's the kind of value the mayors bring to the regional council.

I hope we don't get hung up on the numbers just because some communities are smaller than others and therefore the numbers don't quite add up. Well, they don't add up in terms of Nickel Belt. They don't add up in terms of Rainy River or Algoma. But do we begrudge ridings such as Rainy River, Algoma or Lake Nipigon the fact that they have more votes per person than the member for Markham? We don't begrudge that fact. We say that's a fact of Canadian life. We say that in some instances, it makes sense, for historical reasons, to allow people that sort of representation.

In the minute and a half I have left, I would like to quickly mention that policing is certainly an issue, and we've heard this before. I think the government has done a poor job in terms of addressing the concerns of the municipalities in the Ottawa-Carleton area with regard to the policing issue.

The most recent report shows there's a tremendous variance in the cost of policing, and this is reflective of the fact that there are different kinds of communities. The city of Ottawa is very different from Nepean in terms of the need for policing—

*Interjection.*

**Mr David Johnson:** It's not six o'clock yet—and consequently the cost per capita in the city of Nepean is

\$127 and the cost per capita in the city of Ottawa is \$168. The ratio of police officers is much different and the needs are different.

If we are to amalgamate all the police forces together, those kinds of issues have to be addressed. If there's outstanding debt associated with the police services in any municipality, who picks up that debt? That kind of issue has not been well dealt with by this government in approaching this bill. Neither have the other issues I mentioned of economic development, of the sewer

services, and I would suggest that if we allow this to go for public debate and hearings in the city of Ottawa, those issues could be well addressed.

**The Acting Speaker:** I thank the member for Don Mills for his participation in this debate. At this time, there is no time for questions or comments, but there will be when debate resumes.

This House stands adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 1800.



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO  
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

**Lieutenant Governor/Lieutenant-gouverneur: Lt Col The Hon/L'hon Henry N.R. Jackman CM, KStJ, BA, LLB, LLD**

**Speaker/Président: Hon/L'hon David Warner**

**Clerk/Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers**

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals/Greffier adjoint principal et Greffier des journaux: Alex D. McFedries**

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees/Greffière adjointe et Greffière des comités: Deborah Deller**

**Sergeant at Arms/Sergent d'armes: Thomas Stelling**

| Constituency/Circonscription | Member/Député(e)                       | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités   |
|------------------------------|--|-------------|---|
| Algoma                       | <b>Wildman, Hon/L'hon Bud</b>          | ND          | Minister of Environment and Energy, minister responsible for native affairs / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones                              |
| Algoma-Manitoulin            | Brown, Michael A.                      | L           |   |
| Beaches-Woodbine             | <b>Lankin, Hon/L'hon Frances</b>       | ND          | Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce  |
| Brampton North/-Nord         | McClelland, Carman                     | L           |   |
| Brampton South/-Sud          | Callahan, Robert V.                    | L           |   |
| Brant-Haldimand              | Eddy, Ron                              | L           |   |
| Brantford                    | <b>Ward, Hon/L'hon Brad</b>            | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Finance / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Finances  |
| Bruce                        | Elston, Murray J.                      | L           |   |
| Burlington South/-Sud        | Jackson, Cameron                       | PC          |   |
| Cambridge                    | <b>Farnan, Hon/L'hon Mike</b>          | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Education and Training / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de l'Éducation et de la Formation  |
| Carleton                     | Sterling, Norman W.                    | PC          |   |
| Carleton East/-Est           | Morin, Gilles E.                       | L           | Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président de la chambre et Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative   |
| Chatham-Kent                 | Hope, Randy R.                         | ND          |   |
| Cochrane North/-Nord         | Wood, Len                              | ND          |   |
| Cochrane South/-Sud          | Bisson, Gilles                         | ND          |   |
| Cornwall                     | Cleary, John C.                        | L           |   |
| Don Mills                    | Johnson, David                         | PC          |   |
| Dovercourt                   | <b>Silipo, Hon/L'hon Tony</b>          | ND          | Minister of Community and Social Services / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires   |
| Downsview                    | Perruzza, Anthony                      | ND          |   |
| Dufferin-Peel                | Tilson, David                          | PC          |   |
| Durham Centre/-Centre        | White, Drummond                        | ND          |   |
| Durham East/-Est             | Mills, Gordon                          | ND          |   |
| Durham West/-Ouest           | Wiseman, Jim                           | ND          |   |
| Durham-York                  | O'Connor, Larry                        | ND          |   |
| Eglinton                     | Poole, Dianne                          | L           |   |
| Elgin                        | North, Peter                           | Ind         |   |
| Essex-Kent                   | Hayes, Pat                             | ND          |   |
| Essex South/-Sud             | Crozier, Bruce                         | L           |   |
| Etobicoke-Humber             | Henderson, D. James                    | L           |   |
| Etobicoke-Lakeshore          | <b>Grier, Hon/L'hon Ruth</b>           | ND          | Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé   |
| Etobicoke-Rexdale            | <b>Philip, Hon/L'hon Ed</b>            | ND          | Minister of Municipal Affairs, minister responsible for the office for the greater Toronto area / ministre des Affaires municipales, ministre responsable du Bureau de la région du grand Toronto |
| Etobicoke West/-Ouest        | Stockwell, Chris                       | PC          |   |
| Fort William                 | McLeod, Lyn                            | L           | Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition   |
| Fort York                    | Marchese, Rosario                      | ND          |   |
| Frontenac-Addington          | <b>Wilson, Hon/L'hon Fred</b>          | ND          | Minister without Portfolio and chief government whip / ministre sans portefeuille et whip en chef du gouvernement   |
| Grey-Owen Sound              | Murdoch, Bill                          | PC          |   |
| Guelph                       | Fletcher, Derek                        | ND          |   |
| Halton Centre/-Centre        | Sullivan, Barbara                      | L           |   |
| Halton North/-Nord           | Duignan, Noel                          | ND          |   |
| Hamilton Centre/-Centre      | <b>Christopherson, Hon/L'hon David</b> | ND          | Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels   |
| Hamilton East/-Est           | <b>Mackenzie, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>        | ND          | Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail  |

| Constituency/Circonscription                    | Member/Député(e)                      | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités  |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| Hamilton Mountain                               | <b>Charlton, Hon/L'hon Brian A.</b>   | ND          | Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House leader and minister responsible for the automobile insurance review / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire du gouvernement et ministre délégué à l'Assurance-automobile  |
| Hamilton West/-Ouest                            | <b>Allen, Hon/L'hon Richard</b>       | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère du Développement économique et du Commerce  |
| Hastings-Peterborough                           | <b>Buchanan, Hon/L'hon Elmer</b>      | ND          | Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales   |
| High Park-Swansea                               | <b>Ziembra, Hon/L'hon Elaine</b>      | ND          | Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for human rights, disability issues, seniors' issues and race relations / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre déléguée aux Droits de la personne, aux Affaires des personnes handicapées, aux Affaires des personnes âgées et aux Relations interraciales |
| Huron   | Klopp, Paul                           | ND          |  |
| Kenora  | Miclash, Frank                        | L           |  |
| Kingston and The Islands / Kingston et Les Îles | Wilson, Gary                          | ND          |  |
| Kitchener                                       | Ferguson, Will                        | Ind         |  |
| Kitchener-Wilmot                                | Cooper, Mike                          | ND          |  |
| Lake Nipigon/Lac-Nipigon                        | <b>Pouliot, Hon/L'hon Gilles</b>      | ND          | Minister of Transportation, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Transports, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones   |
| Lambton   | MacKinnon, Ellen                      | ND          |  |
| Lanark-Renfrew                                  | Jordan, Leo                           | PC          |  |
| Lawrence  | Cordiano, Joseph                      | L           |  |
| Leeds-Grenville                                 | Runciman, Robert W.                   | PC          |  |
| Lincoln   | Hansen, Ron                           | ND          |  |
| London Centre/-Centre                           | <b>Boyd, Hon/L'hon Marion</b>         | ND          | Attorney General, minister responsible for women's issues / procureure générale, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine   |
| London North/-Nord                              | Cunningham, Dianne                    | PC          |  |
| London South/-Sud                               | Winninger, David                      | ND          |  |
| Markham   | Cousens, W. Donald                    | PC          |  |
| Middlesex                                       | Mathysen, Irene                       | ND          |  |
| Mississauga East/-Est                           | Sola, John                            | Ind         |  |
| Mississauga North/-Nord                         | Offer, Steven                         | L           |  |
| Mississauga South/-Sud                          | Marland, Margaret                     | PC          |  |
| Mississauga West/-Ouest                         | Mahoney, Steven W.                    | L           |  |
| Muskoka-Georgian Bay                            | Waters, Daniel                        | ND          |  |
| Nepean  | Daigeler, Hans                        | L           |  |
| Niagara Falls                                   | Harrington, Margaret H.               | ND          |  |
| Niagara South/-Sud                              | <b>Coppen, Hon/L'hon Shirley</b>      | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs  |
| Nickel Belt                                     | <b>Laughren, Hon/L'hon Floyd</b>      | ND          | Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances   |
| Nipissing                                       | Harris, Michael D.                    | PC          |  |
| Norfolk   | Jamison, Norm                         | ND          |  |
| Northumberland                                  | Fawcett, Joan M.                      | L           |  |
| Oakville South/-Sud                             | Carr, Gary                            | PC          |  |
| Oakwood   | Rizzo, Tony                           | ND          |  |
| Oriole  | Caplan, Elinor                        | L           |  |
| Oshawa  | <b>Pilkey, Hon/L'hon Allan</b>        | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Municipal Affairs / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Affaires municipales   |
| Ottawa Centre/-Centre                           | <b>Gigantes, Hon/L'hon Evelyn</b>     | ND          | Minister of Housing / ministre du Logement   |
| Ottawa East/-Est                                | Grandmaitre, Bernard                  | L           |  |
| Ottawa-Rideau                                   | O'Neill, Yvonne                       | L           |  |
| Ottawa South/-Sud                               | McGuinty, Dalton                      | L           |  |
| Ottawa West/-Ouest                              | Chiarelli, Robert                     | L           |  |
| Oxford  | Sutherland, Kimble                    | ND          |  |
| Parkdale  | Ruprecht, Tony                        | L           |  |
| Parry Sound                                     | Eves, Ernie L.                        | PC          |  |
| Perth   | Haslam, Karen                         | ND          |  |
| Peterborough                                    | Carter, Jenny                         | ND          |  |
| Port Arthur                                     | <b>Wark-Martyn, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b> | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Health / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Santé   |



| Constituency/Circonscription  | Member/Député(e)                      | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités   |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Prescott and Russell /<br>Prescott et Russell                                     | Poirier, Jean                         | L           |   |
| Prince Edward-<br>Lennox-South Hastings/<br>Prince Edward-Lennox-<br>Hastings-Sud | Johnson, Paul R.                      | ND          |   |
| Quinte  | O'Neil, Hugh                          | L           |   |
| Rainy River   | <b>Hampton, Hon/L'hon<br/>Howard</b>  | ND          | Minister of Natural Resources /<br>ministre des Richesses naturelles  |
| Renfrew North/-Nord   | Conway, Sean G.                       | L           |   |
| Riverdale   | <b>Churley, Hon/L'hon<br/>Marilyn</b> | ND          | Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations /<br>ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce   |
| S-D-G & East Grenville /<br>S-D-G et Grenville-Est                                | Villeneuve, Noble                     | PC          |   |
| St Andrew-St Patrick  | Akande, Zanana L.                     | ND          |   |
| St Catharines   | Bradley, James J.                     | L           |   |
| St Catharines-Brock   | Haeck, Christel                       | ND          |   |
| St George-St David  | Murphy, Tim                           | L           |   |
| Sarnia  | Huget, Bob                            | ND          |   |
| Sault Ste Marie /<br>Sault-Sainte-Marie   | Martin, Tony                          | ND          |   |
| Scarborough-Agincourt   | Phillips, Gerry                       | L           |   |
| Scarborough Centre/-Centre  | Owens, Stephen                        | ND          |   |
| Scarborough East/-Est   | Frankford, Robert                     | ND          |   |
| Scarborough-Ellesmere   | <b>Warner, Hon/L'hon David</b>        | ND          | Speaker / Président   |
| Scarborough North/-Nord   | Curling, Alvin                        | L           |   |
| Scarborough West/-Ouest   | <b>Swarbrick, Hon/L'hon<br/>Anne</b>  | ND          | Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation /<br>ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs   |
| Simcoe Centre/-Centre   | Wessenger, Paul                       | ND          |   |
| Simcoe East/-Est  | McLean, Allan K.                      | PC          |   |
| Simcoe West/-Ouest  | Wilson, Jim                           | PC          |   |
| Sudbury   | Murdock, Sharon                       | ND          |   |
| Sudbury East/-Est   | <b>Martel, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b>      | ND          | Minister of Northern Development and Mines /<br>ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines  |
| Timiskaming   | Ramsay, David                         | L           |   |
| Victoria-Haliburton   | Vacant                                |             |   |
| Waterloo North/-Nord  | Witmer, Elizabeth                     | PC          |   |
| Welland-Thorold   | Kormos, Peter                         | ND          |   |
| Wellington  | Arnott, Ted                           | PC          |   |
| Wentworth East/-Est   | Morrow, Mark                          | ND          |   |
| Wentworth North/-Nord   | Abel, Donald                          | ND          |   |
| Willowdale  | Harnick, Charles                      | PC          |   |
| Wilson Heights  | Kwinter, Monte                        | L           |   |
| Windsor-Riverside   | <b>Cooke, Hon/L'hon<br/>David S.</b>  | ND          | Minister of Education and Training, minister responsible for the<br>Ontario Training and Adjustment Board / ministre de l'Éducation<br>et de la Formation, ministre responsable du Conseil ontarien de<br>formation et d'adaptation de la main-d'oeuvre |
| Windsor-Sandwich  | Dadamo, George                        | ND          |   |
| Windsor-Walkerville   | Lessard, Wayne                        | ND          |   |
| York Centre/-Centre   | Sorbara, Gregory S.                   | L           |   |
| York East/-Est  | Malkowski, Gary                       | ND          |   |
| York Mills  | Turnbull, David                       | PC          |   |
| York-Mackenzie  | Beer, Charles                         | L           |   |
| York South/-Sud   | <b>Rae, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>             | ND          | Premier, President of the Executive Council, Minister of<br>Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre, président du Conseil<br>exécutif, ministre des Affaires gouvernementales  |
| Yorkview  | Mammoliti, George                     | ND          |   |

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. The list above appears on subsequent Mondays.

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et le premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, la liste ci-dessus paraît tous les lundis suivants.











# CONTENTS

Monday 28 March 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Irwin Haskett</b>                                       |      |
| Mr McGuinty  | 5185 |
| <b>Employment equity</b>                                   |      |
| Mr Carr  | 5185 |
| <b>Pickering airport land</b>                              |      |
| Mr Wiseman   | 5185 |
| <b>Community witness program</b>                           |      |
| Mr Murphy  | 5185 |
| <b>Hunting and fishing</b>                                 |      |
| Mr Jordan  | 5186 |
| <b>Immigrants</b>  |      |
| Mr Mills   | 5186 |
| <b>Garden City Kiwanis Hockey League novice tournament</b> |      |
| Mr Bradley   | 5186 |
| <b>Community college governance</b>                        |      |
| Mrs Cunningham   | 5186 |
| <b>Job creation</b>  |      |
| Mr Sutherland  | 5187 |

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

|                          |      |
|--------------------------|------|
| <b>Social assistance</b> |      |
| Mr Silipo                | 5187 |
| Mrs McLeod               | 5188 |
| Mrs O'Neill              | 5189 |
| Mr Jackson               | 5189 |
| <b>Ontario Hydro</b>     |      |
| Mr Wildman               | 5196 |
| Mrs McLeod               | 5196 |
| Mr Conway                | 5197 |
| Mr Stockwell             | 5197 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|                        |                  |
|------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Ontario Hydro</b>   |                  |
| Mrs McLeod             | 5191             |
| Mr Wildman             | 5192, 5195, 5196 |
| Mr Stockwell           | 5195             |
| Mr Conway              | 5195             |
| <b>Fire safety</b>     |                  |
| Mrs McLeod             | 5193             |
| Mr Christopherson      | 5193             |
| Mrs Marland            | 5193             |
| Ms Gigantes            | 5194, 5199       |
| Mr Mahoney             | 5199             |
| <b>Police services</b> |                  |
| Mr Jim Wilson          | 5196             |
| Mr Christopherson      | 5196, 5198       |
| Mr Runciman            | 5198             |

## Community planning

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Mr Frankford | 5198 |
| Mr Philip    | 5199 |

## Social assistance

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Jackson | 5200 |
| Mr Silipo  | 5200 |

## Affordable housing

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Mrs Mathysen | 5201 |
| Ms Gigantes  | 5201 |

## MOTIONS

### Private members' public business

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Charlton | 5201 |
| Agreed to   | 5201 |

## PETITIONS

### Violence

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| Ms Poole | 5201 |
|----------|------|

### Employment equity

|         |      |
|---------|------|
| Mr Carr | 5202 |
|---------|------|

### Hospital services

|         |      |
|---------|------|
| Mr Hope | 5202 |
|---------|------|

### Ministry of Natural Resources service centre

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Miclash | 5202 |
|------------|------|

### Sexual orientation

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Tilson | 5202 |
| Mr Cleary | 5203 |
| Mr Arnott | 5204 |

### Firearms safety

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Hope   | 5202 |
| Mr Ramsay | 5204 |

### Photo-radar

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Sorbara | 5203 |
|------------|------|

### Haemodialysis

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Mr Jim Wilson | 5203 |
|---------------|------|

### Casino gambling

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Ms Harrington | 5203 |
|---------------|------|

### Psychotherapy

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Runciman | 5203 |
|-------------|------|

### Lap dancing

|         |      |
|---------|------|
| Mr Hope | 5204 |
|---------|------|

### Tuition fees

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Ruprecht | 5204 |
|-------------|------|

## FIRST READINGS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>North Toronto Business and Professional Women's Club Act, 1994, Bill Pr104, Ms Poole</b> |      |
| Ms Poole  | 5204 |
| Agreed to   | 5204 |

## SECOND READINGS

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and French-language School Boards Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 143, Mr Philip</b> | 5204                   |
| Mr Sterling  | 5205, 5210, 5213       |
| Mr Philip  | 5208, 5213, 5218       |
| Mr Daigeler  | 5209, 5212, 5217, 5218 |
| Mr David Johnson   | 5209, 5217             |
| Mr White   | 5209, 5210, 5214, 5217 |
| Mr Cooper  | 5213                   |
| Mr Stockwell   | 5213                   |
| Ms O'Neill   | 5214, 5218             |
| Deemed adjourned   | 5223                   |

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Ministerial statements

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mrs Marland | 5190 |
|-------------|------|

### Ontario Hydro

|              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| Mr Stockwell | 5190       |
| Mr Wildman   | 5190, 5191 |
| Mr Eves      | 5191       |
| Mr Charlton  | 5191       |
| Mr Conway    | 5191       |

### Government advertising

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| The Speaker | 5190 |
| Mr Daigeler | 5191 |

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 28 mars 1994

## DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| <b>Aide sociale</b> |      |
| M. Silipo           | 5187 |

## DEUXIÈME LECTURE

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant des lois concernant la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et les conseils scolaires de langue française, projet de loi 143, M. Philip</b> | 5204 |
|--|------|



No. 104

N° 104

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Tuesday 29 March 1994**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Mardi 29 mars 1994**



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

*50th anniversary*

**1944–1994**

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 29 March 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 29 mars 1994

The House met at 1332.

Prayers.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS ALTERNATIVE FUELS

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** I would like to take a moment to clear the air on an issue raised by the member for Chatham-Kent last Thursday in the House. The member accused both the provincial and federal Liberal caucuses of failing to support the ethanol fuel industry. The member for Chatham-Kent went on the local media saying the Ontario Liberals had turned their backs on ethanol production in southwestern Ontario.

I would simply like to draw the member's attention to the following, and I'm sorry he's not in the House today: my party's call for support of ethanol fuel production, and meetings arranged with the federal government as early as December 1991; the January 20, 1994, commitment signed by our leader Lyn McLeod for the maintenance of current provincial tax exemptions for at least 10 years, which I might add was prior to his own government statement; the March 22, 1994, letter from my leader Lyn McLeod to the Prime Minister calling on Ottawa to do the same at the federal level.

The people of Chatham-Kent and all across Ontario should know that the provincial Liberal caucus is 100% behind the ethanol industry and the jobs it creates.

Finally, the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs himself recognized the Liberal Party's commitment to ethanol on December 8, 1992, when he said, "The critic from the official opposition has been on his feet many times asking me about ethanol."

Maybe the member from Chatham-Kent could speak to his own minister and get his facts straight before he makes such ridiculous accusations.

## MEN AND WELLNESS CONFERENCE

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** My statement is about a rather unique event I attended recently at the Rama first nations. "Are You Man Enough" was the theme of the Men and Wellness Conference, which saw men of the nine-member first nations come together to nurture and develop a healthy social and physical environment in the community.

I want to thank Chief Norm Stinson and Chief Jeff Monague for their kind invitation to attend the conference, and I'd like to congratulate 19-year-old Ernie Jamieson for his fine presentation, and others who spoke so well.

Conference organizers invited a panel of speakers, held workshop sessions and conducted talking circles over a two-day period. In keeping with the conference theme, I challenged delegates to ask themselves the following questions: Are you man enough to say no to drugs and

alcohol? Are you man enough to say no to spousal abuse? Are you man enough to say no to violence? Are you man enough to build a strong foundation for the future of your families?

I believe the "Are You Man Enough" Men and Wellness Conference will have a ripple effect across the Rama first nations and Christian Island and across the country. Wellness must occur first within the individual before the family and then ultimately the community becomes well. I hope the renewed strength found in the rediscovery of the aboriginal culture at the Men and Wellness Conference will lead to a healthier lifestyle across this province.

## ACTS OF KINDNESS

**Mr David Winninger (London South):** I rise in the House today to highlight a program which promotes social skills at White Oaks Public School in my riding of London South. This initiative is called AOK, standing for Acts Of Kindness. Through show-and-teach sessions featuring skits, rap songs and certificates acknowledging appropriate behaviour, the message of zero tolerance for verbal, emotional or physical violence is reaching students.

Teachers and school staff award AOK certificates, which entitle students to ballots in recognition of good social skills. Every two weeks, the teacher draws names of students from the ballot box to receive prizes, like fluorescent shoelaces or pencils that say, "Caught doing good."

Nearby, the White Oaks Mall merchants endorse this program with a parallel campaign. Security guards, cleaning staff and retailers all award certificates that enable students to enter further gift certificate draws.

The resource teacher-counsellor at White Oaks, Valerie Quant, is campaign coordinator and notes that the pupils are proud of their certificates and enjoy the recognition, and teachers are encouraged to look for positive acts. Vice-principal Bill Tucker feels a change in attitude in turn creates a change in behaviour, and students observe that things are better around the school now.

I laud the White Oaks Public School's AOK program in providing to all students a reminder to be safer and kinder and to provide a positive alternative to unacceptable behaviour such as hitting, threats, name-calling and blaming. Thank you to the members of White Oaks Mall as well.

## CONSEIL SCOLAIRE DE LANGUE FRANÇAISE D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

**M. Charles Beer (York-Mackenzie) :** Cela fait deux ans et demi que le conseil scolaire public francophone d'Ottawa-Carleton est en tutelle. Le projet de loi 143 contient un certain nombre de solutions aux problèmes des conseils scolaires francophones d'Ottawa-Carleton,



mais ne fait aucune référence à la tutelle du conseil public.

Monsieur le ministre, quand allez-vous agir ? Vous savez, comme moi, que deux ans et demi de tutelle n'ont pas réglé les vrais problèmes. La dette du conseil public continue d'augmenter et, ce qui est bien pire encore, les parents n'ont aucun contrôle sur une institution qui est d'une importance stratégique pour eux. Comment le gouvernement néo-démocrate peut-il continuer à priver les parents de tout un conseil scolaire du droit de dire un mot sur ce qui se passe dans leurs écoles ?

Je demande au ministre de s'intéresser au sort du conseil public francophone d'Ottawa-Carleton. Peut-il, aujourd'hui même, nous dire qu'il va mettre fin à la tutelle dans les plus brefs délais ? Les élections s'en viennent au mois de novembre de cette année et il est d'une importance capitale que les parents puissent élire des conseillers scolaires qui vont vraiment les représenter et qui vont être en mesure, avec la collaboration du ministère de l'Éducation, de trouver de vraies solutions aux difficultés que connaît leur conseil scolaire.

1340

#### FORT HENRY SUNSET CEREMONIAL

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** If I have a conflict of interest on this subject, it has to do with the fact that I am a former guardsman of the Old Fort Henry Guard and commandant of the guard going back to the early 1960s.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** The 1960s?

**Mr Cousens:** The 1960s.

Today, I stand to try to protect and defend a tourist attraction for all the province of Ontario, which is in jeopardy of losing one of the major attractions to Kingston and eastern Ontario with this government's thinking. A historical tradition is being threatened, and I would like to call upon the government to rethink what it can do to keep this long-standing tourist attraction alive and attractive to tourists in Ontario.

The sunset ceremonial for the Old Fort Henry Guard is going to be cancelled this year. The sunset ceremonial, with its combined battle re-enactment, its music program, is unique and unmatched worldwide. To cut this program makes little sense. After all, this ceremony is a key tourist attraction and it is always featured in Ontario's advertising in Kingston and Ontario.

The Kingston Area Economic Development Commission estimates that the show contributes up to 20% of the local occupancy of hotels in the area. Losing this show will mean a decrease to tourism.

I say, as one MPP who has had an attraction there and loves the place, please may you look as a government on how you can keep this place alive for the future.

#### NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** I rise today to tell the members of the Legislature of an exciting first that is taking place in my region.

March 9 marked the kickoff of the first ever Neighbourhood Watch program for the deaf in Canada. This is a new and exciting first. The Neighbourhood Watch

program that currently exists in the region of Waterloo relies on the telephone. The new program will be for regional Tty users.

The hearing world is being accommodated by an automated dialling system to send messages. A Tty was donated by Dahlberg Science of Kitchener to the Kitchener Neighbourhood Watch office, and this Tty and five volunteers will form a networking system to send crime messages to all regional Tty users.

Networking is only an interim answer and hopefully future technology will provide for greater accessibility. Networking will be a feasible method at first as the original starting membership will be in the 150 to 200 range.

As the 1,500- to 2,000-member potential is met, it is the hope of the Neighbourhood Watch organization to have a computer system in place that will accommodate the members. The deaf and hard-of-hearing communities will enjoy the additional communications as another link is removed from this barrier.

I would like to commend Paul Barber and members of the Kitchener Neighbourhood Watch, Kathy Barber of the Canadian Hearing Society, Lauralee Brosseau and our five deaf volunteers.

Neighbourhood Watch is a program that benefits any community, but one that is designed to service the needs of all members of our community is a definite plus to any community and will definitely strengthen our fight against crime in Waterloo Region.

I'd like to congratulate everyone involved for taking on this responsibility, seeing a community need and taking action towards solving this need.

#### FIRE SAFETY

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** My statement is directed to the Minister of Housing and to the Solicitor General and it is on the issue of Bill 120. As you know, Bill 120 is the government's legislation to legalize basement apartments, and much has been said about this issue. Municipalities have made their concerns known, community groups have made their positions clear, but the paramount concern must always be safety.

Tragedies have occurred in the city of Mississauga and indeed throughout the province.

The Minister of Housing continues to push this legislation forward without any real response for the safety of those living in basement apartments. She spoke only yesterday of regulations, but in reality these regulations do not require smoke detectors and they do not deal with the issue of residential sprinkler systems.

It is irresponsible for the minister to ram this legislation through this Legislature without addressing these concerns of safety. I implore the Minister of Housing, I implore the Solicitor General to stop this legislation until safety precautions are not only in place, but also with the approval and consent of the firefighter services of this province.

These tragedies must stop. Incidents like those in Mississauga cannot be allowed to continue. Everyone's responsibility must be with the safety of the people of this province.

## CREDIT VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** It gives me great pleasure to join in the Credit Valley Conservation Authority's celebration of 40 years of conservation.

The Credit Valley Conservation Authority, CVCA, began with the efforts of the Lions Clubs of the Credit Valley, Georgetown, Brampton and Orangeville. To mark its 40th year, the authority is exploring new directions in conservation with an emphasis on returning to its grass roots.

The CVCA is much more than an agency that is responsible for flood and erosion control. Many residents of the Credit River's watershed enjoy the authority's outstanding parks. The CVCA also implements conservation programs, studies the watershed, educates the community and provides technical advice to area municipalities on planning and environmental issues. It is appropriate then that the CVCA is shifting its focus from being an authoritative organization to becoming a conservation advocacy group.

Like all conservation authorities, the CVCA faces financial challenges from scarcer tax dollars and provincial funding cuts. The CVCA has accepted this challenge by seeking new funding sources and building stronger partnerships with the private sector.

I wish the Credit Valley Conservation Authority and all the volunteer members the very best in this anniversary year. May you enjoy another 40 years of conservation success, and thank you for all you have done to preserve this beautiful world.

## MIDWIFERY

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** I'm proud to state that this government took the initiative to recognize and legalize the profession of midwifery in Ontario, but I am less than proud of the manner in which this program is being implemented.

Practising Ontario midwives were given a one-time opportunity to apply to assess their qualifications. Successful candidates could then register with the College of Midwives and receive a licence to practice. Unfortunately, this program was poorly managed. Many well-qualified midwives with independent practice were denied entrance while others with less experience were admitted.

Three universities have now begun offering degree programs in midwifery. There is no provision for experienced midwives to obtain advanced standing at this time. This is not efficient use of scarce resources.

We must be concerned that all licensed midwives be properly qualified, but we must also ensure that all qualified midwives be given the opportunity to obtain a licence. This has not happened. The losers are not only those midwives whose livelihoods have been snatched from them, but also the public, yet midwives could save the government money in health care costs.

I urge the Minister of Health to intervene in this matter and correct a great wrong. What began as an enlightened and commendable program should not be allowed to become a fiasco. The member for Chatham-Kent, who is sitting beside me here today, agrees.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

## JOBS ONTARIO TRAINING

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question is for the Minister of Education and Training. Minister, you recently announced that you would be spending \$180,000 to study the Jobs Ontario Training program, a program which we have been saying for many months is just not working.

We understand that the purpose of your study is to find out how employers and Jobs Ontario clients feel about the program, and we suggest you don't need a \$180,000 consultant to tell you that the program isn't working. The people in the businesses of this province will tell you for free, and yes indeed, we have been trying to tell you that for months.

This government has touted the Jobs Ontario Training program as being the cornerstone of its job creation program. In fact, it is the only part of the Jobs Ontario program that is designed by this government. Why has it taken you two years and \$346 million before you decided to find out whether the program is working?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** First of all, I would say to the member that this program, the Jobs Ontario Training program, is part of this government's efforts to get Ontario back to work. There's Jobs Ontario Homes, there's Jobs Ontario Capital, there's Jobs Ontario Youth, there's Jobs Ontario Community Action, there's our base capital program. For you to describe one particular program and say it's the cornerstone, the only program, of this government to create jobs shows how badly informed you are as Leader of the Opposition. That is just silly.

1350

The fact of the matter is that, as of today, there are 41,435 jobs that have been created under the Jobs Ontario Training program. The fact of the matter is that we've saved \$150 million on social assistance costs. That's a fact as well.

Yes, we have spent, and I think it's appropriately so, \$180,000 to have an external review looking at the numbers, to talk to the employers, to talk to the employees so that we can make what is a very good program even better. That builds into the kind of accountability that government should be used to. You should have practised a little accountability like that. Maybe you would have done better.

**Mrs McLeod:** I point out to the minister, as we all know, that all of the other parts of the Jobs Ontario program are renamed capital spending, worthwhile projects but not new. The only part of the program in Jobs Ontario that's new is Jobs Ontario Training and, by any standards of accountability, this program is not working.

Minister, I'll give you one more example of the ways in which Jobs Ontario Training isn't working. In February 1993 you gave a grant of \$650,000 to a company called Select Meat in Guelph. There was no financial check done on the company as part of the grant review; let's talk about accountability. Seven months later, Select Meat went bankrupt. It left 32 people unemployed and it



took \$200,000 of Jobs Ontario money with it.

In at least two other examples you've handed out \$28,000 in Jobs Ontario Training grants to do feasibility studies for jobs creation, and the only job involved there was the hiring of more consultants.

It is no wonder that you have been completely unable to meet your own targets under this program, and that's another measure of failed accountability. You promised to create jobs for 100,000 people when you announced this program. You've only placed 29,000 people in jobs. There's still just a year left to go in the program. Is this not enough evidence for you that this program is not working?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** The fact is that in this program we have 26,535 employers registered, and then the Leader of the Opposition gets up and names one particular employer where there was a difficulty and condemns the entire program. That is the kind of analysis that is really, really amateurish. That doesn't show at all that the program is not working. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. The member for St George-St David is out of order.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition should have come to the jobs fair in her own home town that we had a couple of weeks ago, where over 300 people turned up, most of whom were employers, most of whom got on their feet and said that this was one of the best programs, no red tape and easy to access, that they've ever experienced.

**Mrs McLeod:** I suspect it is exactly those people who will give glowing reports of the report that the government's \$180,000 consultant study will search out.

I would say to the minister that I have talked to some of the 29,000 people who have been involved with the program who've found a placement and who are indeed happy to at least have some short-term work, but I don't believe that if we're talking about accountability for the program you set up in the first place, you can pretend that you're creating the long-term, permanent jobs that you wanted this program to create, and I don't think you should pretend that this is giving real, long-term, relevant training to the people who are being placed in very short-term jobs.

At best, this is a short-term wage subsidy program, and that's not what you set out to provide with Jobs Ontario Training. The bottom line is that you are two thirds of the way through a \$1-billion program and you haven't yet reached one third of your own target.

As of March 4, according to the report from your ministry—and there may be some updated figures in the last couple of weeks that we've not been able to get that would make a slight difference—83,000 people have been enrolled in the program but only 29,000 have jobs. That means that there were 54,000 people left on an indefinite waiting list.

You did create 39,000 jobs with the subsidy program but you only filled 29,000 of these. So with 54,000 people waiting on a waiting list, you have 10,000 empty

jobs. I wonder how you can have 10,000 unfilled jobs when you've got 54,000 people on a waiting list. It seems to me that this program might be renamed too and we'd call it Jobs Ontario Waiting. The only thing—

**The Speaker:** Could the leader place a question, please.

**Mrs McLeod:** The only thing this program has in common with the unemployed people of this province is that they're not working.

Minister, I ask you, is the \$180,000 study going to deal with this kind of administrative chaos in this program where the consultant recommended changes to the program so we could begin to at least meet some of those target goals, or has your study been set up only so that you will hear what you want to hear as part of an ongoing public relations exercise?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I guess what the member doesn't understand—and I still would encourage her to come over for a briefing to the ministry so she could understand the program better, or to the jobs fairs that are existing across the province. The fact of the matter is that, of course, a job that is offered and is worked out with the private sector in this program isn't going to be filled the same day that it's offered. There's pre-employment training that is offered and then the people are placed.

What I don't understand with the member opposite is that maybe what she's advocating is the kind of program that they have in Liberal provinces like Frank McKenna's province where this type of training program to get people off social assistance and into the workplace is costing over \$60,000 per person. This program is costing about one tenth of that to get people off social assistance, to get them the training and to get them into the workplace.

Maybe the Leader of the Opposition would feel a little more comfortable with the program if she would go to a place like Bombardier in her own community, like I did a couple of weeks ago, talk to people who have been through the program, talk to management there, talk to the CAW there. They don't have any kind of the criticism that you have for the program because they see—

**The Speaker:** Would the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** —it working day in and day out.

**Mrs McLeod:** The program does nothing to get people off social assistance into long-term, permanent jobs.

#### SCHOOL CURRICULUM

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My second question is also to the Minister of Education and Training on another issue.

I think you would agree that the math test results that we saw reported from the Scarborough Board of Education today would concern us all. I think you would also agree that those kinds of results, while they will obviously differ from situation to situation, make it very clear how important it is that we do have clear standards and that there are in place tests to measure how well students are meeting those standards.

I would like to suggest to you today that testing and measuring how well students are doing has to begin with a very clear expectation of what we expect our teachers to teach and what kind of skills we believe our students have to learn.

I would ask you today whether you will commit to putting in place very clear expectations across this province of what is to be taught at least in the basic areas of math, literacy and technology, and will you require that our schools then test all students on the basis of these expectations? Will you take these basic steps to ensure that our students are learning what they have to learn?

1400

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I guess what I would ask the Leader of the Opposition is, where has the Liberal Party been for the last period of time? This government has engaged in more assessment of our education system than has ever occurred in the history of this province.

The Leader of the Opposition knows that, because I saw a press clipping in her home town newspaper where she was talking about the education system. The article talked about the Liberal vision of education, of accountability and so forth, and then it finished off by saying, "Of course the NDP government is doing all of that," and we are: the national testing, the provincial testing, the standards for math and language that have been released, The Common Curriculum.

This system is moving to become more accountable than has ever been the case, and I really appreciate the support that the Leader of the Opposition is announcing today for the policies of this government in education.

**Mrs McLeod:** I have always been more than willing to recognize those rare occasions in which the government takes some steps in the right direction. The providing of benchmark tests, which was an initiative begun under a Liberal government, is a continuation of a step in the right direction and one which I fully support.

But I would go on to say to this government that the issue I wanted the minister to address was whether or not they're prepared to put in place core curriculum in basic areas of study. I believe this government is doing a disservice to people across this province in putting in place something which they have called a common curriculum and trying to convince people that it is a core curriculum. The Common Curriculum that this government is endorsing has nothing to do with clear expectation and basic standards.

Boards of education have had to rewrite the core curriculum because it was vague and confusing. Parents couldn't make sense of what it was children were supposed to learn. Teachers can't make sense of what it is they're supposed to teach. There are outcomes about values, and those are not statements about standards that have to be met. Let me give you one example.

The guidelines in the core curriculum say things like, "Students should be able to value literature that employs inclusive, bias-free language," but it doesn't say what that means. We are calling for the government to talk about

core curriculum and standards; we call for it very clearly in the commitment that I make.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the leader place a question, please.

**Mrs McLeod:** That's what I am asking this government again: Will you put in place a core provincial program with clear standards so that students can be tested on those standards?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** What we have done is that when The Common Curriculum was released—and I must say that if the member doesn't agree with The Common Curriculum, then I wish to heck when they were in government they had done something about it. What is the legacy that the Liberal Party has left Ontario on education? The answer is, nothing. They did nothing on public education from 1985 to 1990 with the exception of following through on the commitment that we all made to extend funding. That's the only thing that you did.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** What are you doing, David?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** When The Common Curriculum was released, we indicated very clearly that it was a working document and that we would consult with parents, educators, students, people in the business community and people in labour in order to rewrite that document so that it was a more specific document. The member knows that this document will be rereleased this December, as we announced quite a time ago. If the member has any suggestions of how that should happen, I'm certainly willing to listen.

**Mr Murphy:** They are all deputies.

**The Speaker:** The member for St George-St David is out of order.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** You might even come over and offer some advice.

**Mrs McLeod:** What I want the minister to address is how his government will respond to what is very clearly the key concern of parents and students and in fact of educators across the province, not add to the confusion with some new direction called a common curriculum, but get back to the commitment which is needed today, and that is a commitment to very clear expectations in those core areas and clear standards that we can test students by.

I have said, although I identified the Benchmarks program as a continuation of what the former government was doing, that it is a step in the right direction. But the problem is that the Benchmarks testing program, the kind of testing that was done in the Scarborough board, is done on a random basis; it's not done across the province, with the exception perhaps of grade 9. We don't yet have a testing program that tells parents exactly how their children are doing and whether their children in that school in that system are meeting the standards that the province and the government have set.

Minister, I don't believe that we have to reinvent the wheel again. There is a clear concern. There are boards that are already responding to it, and you surely know the example of the North York board, the fact that it put in place basic core standards and benchmarks for testing for



all its students in math and in literacy. The North York board is doing it, other boards are doing it—

**The Speaker:** Could the leader place a question, please.

**Mrs McLeod:** —we know it can be done and we don't have to wait for the Royal Commission on Learning. Can you learn from this example? Can you understand that we can have clear, measurable standards, and will you not get on with it?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** If the Liberal Party is advocating that we have a clear set of expected outcomes and standards, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr Murphy:** Something the people can understand, David.

**The Speaker:** The member for St George-St David, come to order.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** That's why the Common Curriculum document is being rewritten. That's why we put out—and they're not called benchmarks, they're called standards, because they were redone because we weren't satisfied that the Benchmarks program was adequate or specific enough, so we changed that.

I would just ask the Leader of the Opposition to take a look at her own education document. If you want to be specific, if you want to offer policy advice, then don't write a document that basically says the Liberal Party's in favour of a good education system. Get specific, put your life on the line and have a policy.

#### ONTARIO HYDRO

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Minister of Environment and Energy. Minister, on Sunday the Premier of the province woke up to the reality that Ontario cannot tolerate a Hydro strike. The Premier issued an ultimatum to Ontario Hydro and to its workers, saying that if the two sides didn't settle, he would do it for them.

Minister, your Premier knew he could not allow a strike at Ontario Hydro to occur, because he knew electricity is an essential service to Ontarians. Will you, Minister, and your cabinet and your caucus, instead of yippety-yapping and yelling all the time, today give force to the Premier's words and actions by acknowledging in legislation that electricity in Ontario in 1994 is indeed an essential service?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** The events of yesterday and the previous weeks are evidence that not only did the Premier not wake up to something on Sunday but he had been very much involved in assisting the parties and the Ministry of Labour officials, who are very much involved in assisting the parties, to reach a collective agreement through voluntary discussion and negotiation. It is amazing that we would have a suggestion of that sort after we've just seen yesterday how well collective bargaining can work in this province.

**Mr Harris:** The reason a settlement was reached by Hydro was because the Premier of the province forced them into it. Both sides acknowledged that. Mr Murphy, on behalf of the union, and Mr Strong, on behalf of Ontario Hydro, made it quite clear and acknowledged that

the Premier forced them into it.

Why did this happen? Because the Premier knew, despite his long-held views on collective bargaining, that we had to avoid a strike at all costs. At all costs, we had to avoid that. Perhaps over the next two years we'll find out just what that cost was. However, that's another issue for another day.

The reason the Premier had to avoid a strike at all costs is because he knows electricity is essential to the province of Ontario.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for Downsview.

**Mr Harris:** We know that. Hospitals know that. Industries know that. It seems that in officially stating it and coming forward with the position, only you and the Liberals refuse to acknowledge that. Only you and the Liberals seem to be in the dark as to whether electricity is an essential service or not.

1410

I'm asking you today, as the minister responsible for ensuring a safe and a secure supply of electricity for Ontario, why do you, along with the Liberals, refuse to declare hydro an essential service?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** After the performance of the Leader of the Opposition and her colleagues yesterday, I resent being put in the same box as the Liberals. I would very much say to the leader of the third party: Let's be serious here. Collective bargaining worked in this province. The strength of collective bargaining was shown. Nobody put a gun to anybody's head. The Premier showed leadership and he's been congratulated by both Ontario Hydro and the Power Workers' Union representatives for having done that. The two of them worked very hard to negotiate a collective agreement and show that collective bargaining is strong and works in this province.

**Mr Harris:** I think the head of the union and the head of Hydro acknowledge that the Premier forced them into a settlement. I think that's very clear. Businesses, hospitals, mines, factories, municipalities, workers and those concerned about safety in our streets should never have had to worry about the loss of an essential service such as electricity in the very first place. You know that. Ontario cannot function without electricity. Those who live near nuclear plants should not have had to worry about the safety of the nuclear plants if they were required to meet those commitments.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for Huron.

**Mr Harris:** We now know that they were required or the commitments could not have been met.

Pure and simple, it's this: If what makes our industries work, if what keeps our hospitals running, if what keeps our families safe, warm and working is not an essential service, what, according to your definition and the Liberal definition, is an essential service?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The leader of the third party should be very, very congratulatory to the two parties for how hard they worked to ensure that collective bargaining

would be successful. Both the Power Workers' Union and the management of Ontario Hydro recognize the importance of that operation to the economy of this province, to the factories, to the residents of this province, to the hospitals and to the schools, and that is why they made a commitment to do everything possible to ensure that a collective bargaining process would be successful. We did it. We should be celebrating, not second-guessing.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mr Harris:** You would be well advised to deal with the situation for the next time so we don't go through the same kind of fearmongering and the same kind of concerns.

**The Speaker:** Would the leader of the third party please place his second question.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** Over a year ago, my caucus presented a nine-point plan to improve accountability in the welfare system and to reduce costs by cracking down on abuse. Yesterday, over a year later, you announced your plan. Minister, it is far too little and it is much too late. Your answer to the problem, the only solution I saw, seems to me to be typical of NDP and Liberal philosophy: Create a bigger bureaucracy. That was the only answer we saw.

Yet although we pointed out example after example and recommendation after recommendation, and you have other jurisdictions which have moved on these fronts, you did not give the existing review officers any additional tools or any clear direction on how they can prevent abuse in the first place. Why not?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** It's hard to answer a question that asks, "Why not?" when in fact the answer is, "We have."

**Mr Harris:** Well, if that's your answer—

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I haven't finished. I think the announcement that I made yesterday outlined very clearly, and I can assure the member that the instructions that are going out to our staff and the instructions that are going out to municipalities and the discussions that we will be having with them will make it absolutely clear, that we are very clear on the need to do the systematic investigations and review that I outlined yesterday, to do that in a way that focuses initially, during the first six months, on those cases that we believe have the most potential for abuse and to ensure as a result that we are indeed protecting the system for those who need it.

**Mr Harris:** I think you know as well as we do that unless we reduce the overall envelope of welfare costs in the province, we're not going to be in a position, we're not going to be able to afford to help those who truly need help and in some cases much more help than we're giving them today.

During the biggest boom years of the province, under the changes brought in by the Liberals, welfare costs went up, if you can believe that. You know that and I know that. The Ontario government, over the last 10 years, has increased welfare eligibility to the point that the system has gone from costing \$1 billion to over \$6 billion a year in a 10-year period.

For example, in that 10-year period 16- and 17-year-olds have been simply saying, "I don't want to live at home any more," and they are eligible for welfare. As well, there are some 32,000 students in Ontario today collecting welfare because they say they want to. Why didn't you address this situation in yesterday's announcement?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I need to correct the member when he says that 16- and 17-year-olds can simply decide that they don't want to live at home and therefore become eligible for social assistance. That is not what the provisions are. In order for 16- and 17-year-olds to be able to be eligible for social assistance, they have to demonstrate, and the worker has to be satisfied, that there is an issue of abuse that's there. I think we would want to ensure—

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** That is not true.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I think there is an answer to the question, if I'm allowed to give it, and that is that what we have to do in that particular area is strike the kind of balance I hope we would all support, which is that we have to be able to continue to provide support in those instances where there is abuse or other legitimate reasons for the young person leaving home but to also make it clear that we will not support young people simply leaving home, and becoming automatically eligible for social assistance. I can tell the member that we are looking at how we can strike that balance in a better way, but I think it's important that we set the rules straight and that we describe the rules as they exist in the most straightforward fashion.

The leader of the third party also talked about the increasing costs of welfare. We all acknowledge, as he has acknowledged, the fact that even during the boom years costs have continued to go up. That is why we have ventured on some significant reforms and some significant changes that will assist individuals in moving off social assistance. We believe that we can still bring about some of those changes. I'd be happy to outline over the next number of weeks what we can do.

We obviously, as a result of what the federal government has been doing to us, have not been able to carry forward with all of those changes in terms of the child income program which we believed were going to be a fundamental improvement in the quality of life for all people of low incomes, but we are intent on proceeding with a number of the training and support initiatives that will help—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister please conclude his response.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** —people to move off social assistance, to move off the dependency of social assistance. That, together with the initiatives that I outlined yesterday, will give us both a more effective and a more humane social assistance system in the province.

**Mr Harris:** It is not good enough simply to say the federal Liberals have abandoned the poor in Ontario, the helpless, the needy. It's true, but it's not enough just to lay the blame there, because in spite of the despicable actions of the federal Liberals in Ottawa, there is much, Minister, that you can do. There is much that you can do



even in spite of the complete abandonment of Ontario by the federal Liberals in Ottawa.

For example, you are still directly depositing welfare cheques into bank accounts, you have not reinstated home visits, you did not adopt the Quebec review system we brought to your attention and you admitted yesterday that you have absolutely no handle on the extent of the problem. You think it's more than 3% but you have no handle on it.

1420

Since you are not willing to get to the bottom of the situation, will you—and you acknowledge you don't know the magnitude of the problem—immediately ask the Provincial Auditor to step in and conduct an audit of our entire welfare system, which now is costing over \$6 billion a year?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** Mr Speaker, on one point at least, I stand corrected. The member is right in that I shouldn't have put the blame completely on the federal Liberals; I should have also pointed out the great disservice that the previous Conservative government has also done to the province of Ontario.

I think that what we have to do in this issue is—we can choose to debate from here till doomsday what the level of fraud and abuse in the system is, and I'm not sure that would get us any further ahead in dealing with the real problems we have, both in terms of abuse and in terms of some of the other issues outside of the question of abuse.

I also don't think that putting a worker in everyone's home is necessarily the way to address the issues that we've got. I know that the workers in our system have the ability to use home visits where they think that's an appropriate mechanism. I think what we have to do is continue the process that we have been undertaking for some time, to which we've added some significant steps in the announcement that I made yesterday, which will give us, I think once and for all, the kind of control over the system that we need, not just in the system that we are directly responsible for running as a province but also the other half of the systems that the municipalities are responsible for. That's what we are intending to do.

#### WATER QUALITY

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a question to the Minister of Environment. Mr Minister, you will be aware of a discussion and information that was released today, Radio Noon, CBC, which indicated that last night at a public advisory meeting, which I believe was held in Elmira, a report was made public for the first time. This report contained, I believe, some very disturbing news about the presence of a particular chemical in the groundwater which has a potential of leakage into the Grand River. My question is: What information can you share with this House today on this matter?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** I must say that I wasn't privy to the radio program to which the member refers so I'm not quite sure what matter he's referring to with regard to the report in Elmira, but I will take his question under advisement and report back to the House.

**Mr Offer:** I was hoping that the Minister of Environment would be aware of this type of information which would be so crucial to the community and the surrounding area, and I take note that he will respond and report back to the Legislature.

I would also like the minister, in his response back to the Legislature, to comment on the fact that this report was made known to the Ministry of Environment as long ago as February and not made public until last night. This is of crucial importance as to why a report of this nature and magnitude, which has this impact in terms of the environment, would not have been made public immediately by you and your ministry upon it being brought to your attention.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** If the member's information is accurate, then I am very concerned. Obviously, as I indicated, I'm not aware of the content of the radio report or the report that is reported to have been released in Elmira or how long it might have been held within the ministry, that the ministry had knowledge of it. So I will get all of that information and report back to the member. If his information is accurate, I do take it as very serious.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION OFFICE

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Yesterday, the Deputy Prime Minister, Sheila Copps, announced that a prestigious environmental office will be awarded to Montreal.

In making her announcement she blamed your Premier's opposition to NAFTA for the decision not to award the office to Toronto. The residents of Ontario, and particularly Toronto, want to know what you're going to do to reverse this discrimination against Ontario.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Deputy Premier):** I think the Premier has been quoted on several occasions as to his reaction to that explanation. The explanation—

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** You can't suck and blow at the same time, Floyd.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Well, a Liberal across the floor has suggested we can't suck and blow at the same time. The last time I checked, I thought the federal Liberals had opposed NAFTA as well. That's what I was always led to believe.

What I want to have explained to me is how an Ontario-based minister, namely, the Deputy Prime Minister, from Hamilton yet, who also was interested in achieving this centre, would stand in her place and say that Montreal is the best location for the centre. This is a federal Liberal. I'd also ask, where in the world were the 98 federal Liberals elected from the province of Ontario when this decision was being made?

In the interest of brevity, I will sit down and look forward to the supplementary from the member.

**Mr Tilson:** Well, I'm sure the Deputy Premier will save the best until last.

Ms Copps clearly said that she tried to secure a letter of intent from the Premier of the province of Ontario with respect to the implementation of the NAFTA side agreements, not to embarrass Canada. The Premier wouldn't play ball. He would not give that letter of intent. He wouldn't make that commitment. That's simply

why she said that Montreal was chosen, because of the lack of commitment by the Premier of Ontario. My question to the Deputy Premier: Are the Liberals wrong?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I wanted to make it clear. We have checked to find out if anybody in Ottawa had requested any kind of letter or indication of support from us. We cannot find a single request that came from the federal government for us to support their bid for that centre.

Perhaps a community leader from elsewhere in the province said it better than I could say it. The mayor of Windsor, Mike Hurst, is quoted in today's Windsor Star as saying the following: "Laying the blame for the city of Windsor or the city of Hamilton not getting this particular commission at the feet of the Premier is dirty politics and political crap of the worst possible kind."

I believe it's becoming clearer and clearer and clearer to the people of this province that having elected 98 Liberals federally from this province hasn't meant that this province is well represented at the cabinet table in Ottawa. That is becoming increasingly clear.

1430

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** I'd really like to pose a question to the Prime Minister of Canada on why he's neglecting my community, but I will pose my question to the second-best, which is the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, who I know will not turn her back on my constituents.

A recent Toronto Star story reported that the government had a plan for an additional 300 teletheatres in Ontario. This report has caused great concern to me and the horse racing industry in my riding.

Minister, why are you introducing this plan when you know that members of the industry are concerned about the impact of the teletheatre on live racing?

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** Although I'm surprised I come second-best with you—I'm sure I'm number one—I'm really glad the member asked that question. Contrary to a statement in the Star that I was announcing a new government gaming plan, I was not announcing a new government gaming plan. We announced in the 1992 budget that we would be proceeding with teletheatres and Pro Line lotteries. We are now simply implementing what we announced then.

Specific to your question, there is no fixed number of teletheatres. The ultimate number will reflect the marketplace and the needs of the horse racing industry, and we will be continuing to discuss with them how much further we will go with teletheatres in Ontario.

**Mr Hope:** In your answer to the question, you say you will guarantee. I need a guaranteed commitment from you, Madam Minister, that you will consult with the horse racing industry before any decisions are further implemented in this province.

**Hon Ms Churley:** We always consult with the horse racing industry before we proceed on any of these issues that affect it. In fact, my staff and I are working closely with the industry at this time. We've created a whole-

sector strategy round table to discuss all kinds of issues that are relevant to the horse racing industry these days, and the role of teletheatres will continue to be discussed with all the sectors in the industry before we take it any further. Right now there are only 75 applications before us, up to 75, and about 60 of them are open, so we will continue that discussion with the industry.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Interjection:** Just hold up the number of the answer.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** Well, I have a question that I don't think any of the numbers will fit. They may try.

My question's a very serious one. I was going to ask the Minister of Education, but I think I'll ask the Minister of Community and Social Services.

Educators across the province—and they to a certain extent have to monitor this situation—are expressing increasing concern about the number of students who are now receiving welfare benefits but are not attending school consistently.

It was my understanding and the understanding, I think, of municipalities across the province that are trying to address this that the students had to be consistently attending school to receive those benefits. Could the minister explain how it is that so many students across this province appear not to be attending school regularly but are still receiving those benefits?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I appreciate the member raising this question. I know it is a very serious issue, and it is certainly one, as I've talked to people throughout the province, from people on social assistance with respect to their own children, and to teachers and others, that I know is a very legitimate concern.

It is my view, and I want to be very clear, that if we are providing assistance to 16- and 17-year-olds, because I think those are largely the people we are talking about, that there is and there should be a reasonable expectation on our part that they be in school, and if they're not in school, there has to be a very good reason they're not.

I've heard the concerns. I am not sure why the confusion is out there, because my understanding is that the expectations and the rules we have are reasonably clear.

In light of the concerns that have been expressed, I can tell the member opposite that we have been looking at this and we will be issuing clarification, if that's what's needed, to the system, both the provincial system and the municipal system, because I know a lot of the concerns have been expressed particularly through the municipalities.

This is an issue we do need to get at and do need to resolve as quickly as possible.

**Mr Bradley:** Members of the House on all sides will know there are a number of students out there who come from genuinely very difficult circumstances at home, terrible situations at home, and this is whom the program was supposed to apply to.

But increasingly we are getting reports that a significant number of people in the age bracket the minister is



talking about are using the threat of being able to get welfare to lever their parents in terms of discipline and order within the household.

Could the minister explain to the House how the government is going to deal with the problem of having the students using that against their parents as a possibility of leaving home and having a way of living if the parents don't comply with the requests? Could he tell us how that's going to be addressed? We are getting a report that that is being thwarted centrally. Whether it's by the Social Assistance Review Board or your ministry, centrally, municipalities are having a hard time having their concerns backed up.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I don't think I can outline for the member in detail today all the steps we are taking to try to address this, but I do want to say to him that we are, because this is a very important issue.

This question of both the perception and the way in which the rules are being used or understood is something we have to get at. In terms of the rules as they are laid out, they seem to be reasonably clear that some form of abuse or some concern about abuse has to be established, and it's not a question of the worker simply taking the young person's word for that. There has to be a process, and there is a process that is supposed to be followed so that the worker and/or his or her supervisors can satisfy themselves that there is some element of that which has been established. That is usually done by the worker talking to the parents, the worker talking to other people where that's necessary, and verifying that.

It's obviously clear to me, in light of the concerns that have been expressed by municipalities and others, that we need to be clear about what those steps are that have to be followed. That's something, as I've said to the member, we are looking at doing, because this is an issue that has to be addressed.

#### FIRE SAFETY

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** Yesterday in this House, the Minister of Housing, in answer to my grave questions about the tragedies in Mississauga, referred all of us to the draft regulation changes to the fire code. What this minister did not tell this House, however, is that those draft regulations were finalized last May.

This minister has to answer to this House. Since last May, we have had four deaths in basement apartments in Mississauga. Since last May, we have had three deaths in basement apartments in Scarborough. These regulations do not need legislation; they do not need to wait for the passage of Bill 120. The proposed regulation changes could have saved seven lives, including two babies.

I would ask this minister to stand in this House and tell us, when your government believed so passionately in basement apartments that you have already amended the building code, why have you not made the changes that you know are necessary to protect people in existing apartments by addressing the regulations in the fire code?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** The work that has been done around the fire code regulations that apply to apartments in houses is work that comes

together with the passage of that bill in this way—and I hope the member will finally start to understand the connection, as it's very important: You can't make things safe if they're not legal. As long as basement apartments operate in a black market, we can write rules till they'd smother you and it's not going to change the situation for people, both owners and occupants, who are afraid to admit to the world that there's an apartment in the house because the zoning makes it illegal.

If she could just get that notion through her head and move Bill 120 on, then we could get the kind of progress she's looking for.

1440

**Mrs Marland:** I will try not to be as personal attacking as the minister, but I will say one thing in this House. If there's one thing I do understand it is that we all bear some responsibility for the fact that seven people have died when possibly fire code regulations could have been implemented last year.

When basement apartments are regulated, the fire chief in Mississauga has said that without a registry, without a right of entry, without a warrant, we still won't be able to know where they are, as the minister has said. However, they exist.

The fact is that yesterday in this House this minister said I attributed things to Chief Hare that he did not say in committee. Mr Speaker, I have to read for you what Chief Hare did say in committee. He said:

"It has been our experience that a justice of the peace will not grant a search warrant without substantial evidence. In 1993, we in fact attempted to obtain a warrant to do an inspection on a residential premises. We had an affidavit from a private individual who had raised concerns, who had been in the property and identified concerns, and the justice of the peace did not give us authority to enter the property to do the inspection."

Those are the words. Why were you trying to tell this House yesterday that Chief Hare did not raise those concerns, which have been reinforced by the recommendations of the coroner's inquest into these deaths, yet everything is on record in Hansard? I would appreciate it if you would read it.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I can assure the member that I have indeed read Chief Hare's statements to the committee with great care. She cares to draw conclusions which I don't draw from those words, which I have read very carefully. What he suggested was that in 1993, without the changes associated with Bill 120, which the member for Mississauga South is attempting to stall, delay and impede, without those changes he did have difficulty getting a search warrant.

He also told the inquest into the tragic death of the two people in the McNutt family, and I'm sure the member is aware of this, that he had never requested an inspection of an apartment in a house—a basement apartment, as I think he described it—and been refused. I have to take the chief's own words in his testimony to the inquest.

**Mrs Marland:** Mr Speaker, I have a point of privilege: The Minister of Housing said that I am impeding the passage of Bill 120. I am not.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** There is clearly a difference of opinion between the two members, which I understand, but no privilege has been lost.

**Mrs Marland:** Mr Speaker, I would appreciate it if you would listen to my point of privilege. The minister just made a statement about my actions. She is impugning my actions as a member of the committee that is debating Bill 120, and I would ask that minister to withdraw that comment.

**The Speaker:** The member will know she does not have a point of privilege. However, another member of the House has said something to which the member takes exception. The member for Ottawa Centre has an opportunity to withdraw her remark.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr Gary Wilson (Kingston and The Islands):** My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. It has to do with the announcement that his ministry will begin a comprehensive investigation to eliminate welfare fraud and other errors in the social assistance system.

I think we all understand the need to control social assistance costs, which have increased dramatically in recent years. Minister, how will you ensure that any investigation carried out by the ministry into current case files is done with fullest respect for the privacy and human rights of the social assistance recipients, who would, after all, rather not be on social assistance at all?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I appreciate the question from the member. We have tried, in the process we've established, which I announced yesterday, to ensure that we strike the appropriate balance between getting at those people in the system who are indeed abusing the system and being absolutely clear in our approach that the vast majority of people who are receiving social assistance benefits are receiving them because they are entitled to receive them.

I can tell the member that in the instructions that are going out to our staff, in the work we are going to do with the municipalities in terms of how they are going to implement similar initiatives, we are going to continue to be absolutely clear about those two points having to be kept uppermost in people's minds.

In the way we've set out the process, focusing first, in terms of the time lines, on those situations where we believe there is the greatest potential for abuse and not assuming that everyone who's on social assistance shows a potential for abuse, I think we've shown the respect necessary and appropriate for the vast majority of people who are legitimately receiving social assistance benefits.

**Mr Gary Wilson:** This afternoon we've heard that it isn't because of fraud that the welfare costs are so high, but that policies of federal governments as well as things like free trade have forced up the welfare rolls here in Ontario.

What I would like to know, Minister, is that while you are tightening up the system so that only those who are truly entitled receive benefits, what measures will you take to help people get off welfare and into the workforce?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** The member will know that of the steps we outlined last summer in Turning Point, we had to indicate last week that we would not be able to proceed with at least one major part of that, the Ontario child income program, because of the lack of appropriate funding from the federal government.

There are, however, other parts of that reform that we are quite intent on proceeding with. We outlined and we are working hard on a number of initiatives that will assist people to move off the dependency of social assistance through training and other kinds of support, through looking at a number of things we can inject into the system, and through just simple things like providing more publicity for some of the basic rules that exist now in the system under the STEP program, through which people are able to earn some dollars and still retain some of their benefits.

It's a combination of those things that we will continue to do.

#### PAYMENTS TO TEACHERS

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale):** I have a serious question to the Minister of Citizenship on what seems to be a deliberate attempt to punish certain ESL programs.

Two weeks ago, Madam Minister, you received this letter from the TESL association, and I am sending you another copy. This association is the teachers of English-as-a-second-language program. It states that your ministry's cheques are continuously six weeks late, causing the organizers to consider shutting down this important program. For what reason are you punishing this ESL program, and can you promise us today that you will now make these payments on time so our children will continue to receive English-language training?

**Hon Elaine Ziemba (Minister of Citizenship):** I appreciate the question from the member opposite and tell you that I have not personally seen this letter. It just arrived here at this moment in front of me, so I will take this under consideration and read the letter carefully.

But I want to make one comment before I sit down. I say to the member opposite that what we have done within our ministry is help the programs that are teaching ESL. Mr Bradley is probably going to show a number at this particular time, but if you take a look at the average amount of dollars that is spent per immigrant by the federal government in the various provinces across Canada, you would find that most provinces get \$1,500. The average payment per immigrant in Quebec is \$1,900. Ontario receives \$780 per immigrant.

1450

We are doing our best to make sure that we provide the best quality service. We have not cut our funding; in fact, we have been trying to pick up the lapse that the federal government has not given to us. That is why we are entering into an agreement with the federal government to make sure, not just that we are getting our fair share, although that's important, but that people who choose to live in Ontario are treated equally and fairly as all people are treated across Canada and that they are not penalized because they have chosen to come to this great province.



## PETITIONS

## SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I have a petition regarding Bill 45 and Bill 55. The petition asks that we earnestly request the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to refrain from passing both bills. I've signed the petition.

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** One of the signatures on this petition is from Utopia. We have people from Barrie and Orillia and Markham and Unionville.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas traditional family values that recognize marriage as a union between a man and a woman are under attack by Liberal MPP Tim Murphy and his private member's bill 45; and

"Whereas this bill would recognize same-sex couples and extend to them all the same rights as heterosexual couples; and

"Whereas the bill was carried with the support of an NDP and Liberal majority but with no PC support in the second reading debate on June 24, 1993; and

"Whereas this bill is currently within the legislative committee on the administration of justice and is being readied for quick passage in the Legislature; and

"Whereas this bill has not been fully examined for financial and societal implications,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to stop this bill and future bills which would grant same-sex couples the right to marry and to consider its impact on families in Ontario."

I have affixed my signature to this petition with some 350 signatures.

## VIOLENCE

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I have an additional 26 petitions that have sent to me from the towns of Whitney, Barry's Bay, Petawawa, Chalk River and Eganville which I would like to read out.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;

"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to admire or emulate but rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

There are 257 names on these petitions. Added to the

ones yesterday, that is now 577 signatures.

## HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas several patients from the Collingwood area are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in the Collingwood area;

"Whereas the government continues to insist that they are studying the problem, even though they have known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in Alliston and Collingwood,

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of Collingwood."

## PAY EQUITY

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** I'd like to present a petition on behalf of my colleague from Cambridge:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, hereby petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario Ministry of Labour down payment funding for pay equity re-examine the application for pay equity advance payment 1992-93 in connection with the Cambridge Association for the Mentally Handicapped, and that the commission examine the relationship between other similar organizations that have been granted the initial payment to determine whether the application of rules applied to one are equally applied to the other.

## TAXATION

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Orillia):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the government of Ontario has consistently mismanaged its finances and failed to support the economy of the province;

"Whereas the government's new tax agenda has hurt many businesses across the province and killed tens of thousands of jobs;

"Whereas the NDP government has lost over \$2 billion in revenue after imposing over \$3 billion in new taxes;

"Whereas the government is raising non-tax revenues through raising fees on everything it can think of including toll roads, photo-radar, snowmobile fees, ferry fees, health services fees, children's services fees, without consultation and without studying the impact of these new fees on local communities;

"Whereas the government is camouflaging its deficit crisis by phantom sales of government buildings;

"Whereas the government is hiding its spending by setting up crown corporations to take on new debt;

"Whereas the government, even after all these questionable measures, has still been unable to control its \$10-billion deficit and is planning to introduce even more taxes which will only lead to further job loss across the province, reduce business confidence and prolong the recession; and

"Whereas the government continues to waste money through tens of thousands of dollars in unjustified expenses on meals and hotels by senior political and ministerial staff;

"We, the undersigned, call upon the government to take action to halt any new tax increases, cut its own wasteful spending, take real action to support business and job creation and get the province of Ontario working again."

I add my name to this petition.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** I have a petition regarding the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination.

This petition was signed by 98 members of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters from my riding of Lanark-Renfrew and it reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time to pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms we have no desire to own or use,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I affix my signature.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** I have a petition. It's addressed to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 55," which I believe is the bill of the Conservative member from Markham, Mr Cousens, "would make it illegal, with fines up to \$50,000, for people to make any public statement, written or oral, which ridicules, demeans or discriminates against a person on the grounds of sexual orientation, still undefined. This is a grave threat to free speech in a democratic society.

"Mr Cousens's bill, which is Bill 55, is also an attack on freedom of those religions which do not condone

homosexuality, ie, Jewish, Muslim, Hindus, Baha'i, Christian etc.

"We want to maintain our basic right to disagree with homosexuality, which in no way should be equated with hatred.

"We have moved away from a position where some homosexuals and other special-interest groups are no longer content to express their ideas, but demand that contrary views be suppressed with stiff penalties.

"At the same time, these special-interest groups will be allowed to teach their controversial alternative lifestyles to youngsters in the classrooms, thereby proselytizing children with their viewpoints without allowing for differing opinions.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Mr Cousens's Bill 55."

It's signed by a number of constituents, and I affix my signature thereto.

1500

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas several patients from the town of New Tecumseth are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments in Orillia or Toronto;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in New Tecumseth, and one patient is forced to pay for her own nurse;

"Whereas the government continues to insist that they are studying the problem, even though they have known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in New Tecumseth and Collingwood;

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of New Tecumseth."

I've signed this petition.

#### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** I'd like to present another petition on behalf of my colleague the member for Cambridge pertaining to the issue of provincial funding and quality for the Catholic school system. It's signed by 251 of his constituents.

#### ONTARIO STOCK YARDS

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming):** I have a petition here signed by 23 farmers from Timiskaming district:

"Dear Mr Ramsay:

"We, the undersigned, feel strongly that all the revenue from the lease of property of the former Ontario Stock Yards should go into the livestock development trust fund. We urge you to speak to the government officials about this matter."



I have affixed my signature to this.

#### MINISTERIAL RESPONSE

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I have two petitions here from Henry Freitag in Penetanguishene, Ontario.

"To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas all individuals of Ontario must be treated within the spirit of a free and democratic society;

"Whereas individuals must be treated by government in a manner consistent with the Ontario and international human rights codes;"

"I, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To replace the Minister, Ms Evelyn Gigantes, with a person more inclined in the democratic duty, in serving the people of a democracy, to provide fair and reasonable information and reply in a positive manner to positive questions."

#### HIGHWAY SIGNS

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I won't read the preamble to the other one. It just says:

"I, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To incorporate to the Highway Traffic Act of Ontario all limitations on parking/no parking, stopping/no stopping, standing/no standing. This would ensure that a visitor coming to Ontario and all drivers from Ontario would be guided and informed by one law and one law only, and hoping that this law be prescribed in a fair and understandable language, in the language of the people who use the roads."

That's signed by Henry Freitag of Penetanguishene.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I've got a petition here addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide the needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and the loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

A lot of my constituents, especially in the community of Sutton-by-the-Lake, have affixed their signature to this and, in full support, I do the same.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr John Sola (Mississauga East):** I have a petition here that was forwarded to me by Christ Our King Lutheran Church in Mississauga and it reads as follows:

To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 55 will make it illegal, with fines up to \$50,000, for people to make any public statement, written or oral, which ridicules, demeans or discriminates against a person on the grounds of sexual orientation, which is still undefined. This is a grave threat to free speech in a democratic society.

"Bill 55 is also an attack on freedom of religion, against historical Christianity, which does not condone homosexuality.

"We want to maintain our basic right to disagree with homosexuality, which in no way should be equated with hatred.

"We have moved away from a position where some homosexuals and other special-interest groups are no longer content to express their ideas, but are demanding that contrary views be suppressed with stiff penalties.

"At the same time, these special-interest groups will be allowed to teach their controversial alternate lifestyles to youngsters in the classroom, thereby proselytizing children with their viewpoints without allowing for different opinions."

It's signed by 85 residents of Mississauga, and I will attach my signature to it.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have a petition addressed to Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I am affixing my signature.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### CITY OF KITCHENER ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Cooper, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr95, An Act respecting the City of Kitchener.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### INTERIM SUPPLY

Mr Laughren moved government notice of motion number 23:

That the Minister of Finance be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing April 1, 1994, and ending July 31, 1994. Such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** The motion of interim supply which I have just moved means that spending authority other than for payments authorized by a specific statute is granted by the Legislature to the government by the process of supply, as governed by the House standing orders and parliamentary tradition.

Prior to the passing of the Supply Act, government spending proceeds under a motion of interim supply. Government spending is currently authorized to March 31, 1994, by the Supply Act, which received royal assent in December 1993. To ensure that spending authority continues after March 31, a motion of interim supply needs to be approved by the Legislature. Without a motion, delays in payments will start April 1, affecting suppliers of goods and services, utility companies, rent payments, doctors, private medical laboratories and transfer payment agencies.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Any questions or comments? Any further debate?

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I am pleased to begin the debate on interim supply. For those who may be watching the debate, what we're dealing with, as the Minister of Finance said, is providing the government with the authority to pay its bills over the next few months.

I want to talk about some of the things that are impacting on our ability to pay our bills.

1510

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Be nice.

**Mr Phillips:** The Minister of Finance said to be nice, and I will. I wanted to start by talking about what, for me at least, and I think for the people of Ontario, is quite clearly the major issue facing the province, and that is the whole issue of jobs.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Excuse me, I'd just like to interrupt you for a few minutes. I just want to read this statement here.

Pursuant to standing order 34(a), the member for Burlington South has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Minister of Community and Social Services concerning social assistance, and this matter will be debated today at 6 o'clock.

**Mr Phillips:** I started by saying that I wanted to talk about what, for me at least, is the number one issue on people's minds; it is on my mind. I spent much of January, February and March travelling around the province talking to people about this issue and hearing about it in a whole variety of communities. I honestly don't think it's overstating the case to say that, in my opinion, the job situation is a state of emergency. I think it's difficult oftentimes to convince perhaps ourselves here of that. I happen to think the people out there believe it.

The challenge you always run into in a thing like this is, if you're in government, you have of course in many respects a vested interest in saying: "Listen, things are getting better. They're going to improve. The opposition is merely exaggerating the size of the problem." Similarly, I think that when you're in opposition, as I am, people many times just assume you're exaggerating the problem for political reasons.

Therefore, the problem I think we face with the job situation is that if we don't collectively all agree on the size of the problem, in my opinion we won't get on with the solution. As I said, I think governments at every level in every part of the country have a vested interest, when you're in power, of saying, "Listen, things are going to get substantially better," and when you're in opposition it's difficult to convince people.

For the Minister of Finance's information, I went back through the last three budgets just to look at the prediction of the unemployment rate for 1994, because while each budget has said things are going to get substantially better, the fact is that they're not.

I went back to the 1991 budget and I looked at what the estimate was for the unemployment rate in Ontario in 1994, the year we're just now moving into. It assumed then that the unemployment rate would be well below 8%; it would be around 7.5% or 7.8%. That was the 1991 budget estimating the unemployment rate for 1994.

The 1992 budget, what did it do? It said things were going to be better in 1994, but instead of a 7.5% unemployment rate, the 1994 unemployment rate was going to be 8.3%. Last year's budget said the unemployment rate in Ontario for 1994 would be around 9%. Now the Minister of Finance's documents indicate that the unemployment rate in Ontario in 1994 will be well over 10%.

My point is this: The people of Ontario have been anticipating that the situation is going to improve; the government had been hoping it would. In my opinion, it is not improving nearly well enough nor, as I might say, nearly as well as the government had been predicting. I really think this is a situation that cries out for—I call it a state of emergency, and I don't think I'm being overly alarmist there.

When the January unemployment numbers came out, I was shocked, actually. They were so bad that I, in some letters I sent out, said: "They're so bad I don't believe them. I think they are a one-month blip. When we have the February numbers, they will be substantially improved." I was at a public meeting with the Minister of Finance. He had the same concerns, I think, about the January unemployment and employment numbers. The February numbers came out and, in my opinion, they were close to as bad as the January numbers.

The numbers are something like this: For us to begin to make a dent in our unemployment situation in Ontario, we need to see around 75,000 to 80,000 jobs a year created in this province. That essentially just holds our unemployment rate, because that's the number of people who enter the workforce. After two months in the province—and I accept they're two of 12 months and we're early into the year—rather than seeing substantial growth year over year, we in Ontario have seen 10,000



fewer jobs. It's extremely serious.

I'm hopeful that the March numbers that come out, and they will be out in a week and a half, will show a dramatic turnaround, but so far the numbers are extremely discouraging. We've lost 10,000 jobs year over year when we should have seen growth at least of 60,000 jobs. We have a shortfall of 70,000 jobs. I might add that in all of the rest of the country we saw job growth in January and February, year over year, of 143,000 jobs. Ontario, for some reason or other, is struggling badly. We actually lost jobs in January and February over the same period a year ago while the rest of the country saw substantial growth.

In behind the numbers—and I'm not sure how to make the case properly here, because when we talk about millions of jobs and hundreds of thousands of jobs, I'm afraid we lose the personal side of it, but these are the numbers we need to work with and I urge us to really get in behind these numbers. I watched the Premier closely. He obviously knows it's a problem. He's spending an awful lot of his time going around the province talking about jobs. But the numbers aren't coming, for a variety of reasons which I'll talk about later.

But if you look behind some of these numbers, where are the big problems in jobs? We all know the construction sector has really suffered badly. By the way, I had fully expected the construction sector to be picking up by now, yet in January and February we had the two worst months in years and years and years for our construction workers. These are the January and February 1994 numbers, the last two months. There were 210,000 people working in construction in Ontario. The same period the previous year there were 243,000 people in construction.

I'm praying it was the cold weather. I'm praying that this isn't indicative of the construction activity out there. But it was a disaster, and it was a disaster because I go back in the construction numbers. In 1989 there were 327,000 people working in construction; in 1990, 324,000. Then we start down: 277,000 in 1991; 254,000 in 1992; 255,000, about the same, in 1993; and then the first two months of what can only be described as a disaster. As I say, I'm hopeful that we will see in March, in another week and a half, that the numbers were dramatically influenced by cold weather and that we will begin to see the pickup.

But those numbers are very discouraging because it comes in an area where the Premier has been talking about capital expenditures and spending the money and the capital, although I must say that the provincial capital spending has actually gone down in each of the last two years, in spite of all the rhetoric. The explanation we get is, "We're buying better," but the amount of money they're spending on capital has actually gone down.

1520

The manufacturing sector has also been extremely hard hit; we've lost almost 20% of our manufacturing jobs. I think we all know that's in many respects the engine that drives Ontario. In fact, without the auto sector, I might say, I think we would be in a disastrous situation. Our auto sector has been extremely buoyant. We've been fortunate, and I think with a lot of hard work by our auto

companies and the CAW, we've got a very solid auto sector in Ontario. We've got some of the best plants—

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** And the provincial government.

**Mr Phillips:** —and the provincial government, the member says. Yes, I think provincial governments overall, for all three parties, have recognized that our auto sector is the engine that drives the Ontario economy, and thank goodness for that. Thank goodness that the US economy is going very well, that many of the vehicles we manufacture in Canada are selling exceptionally well in the US. I think it's fair to say that Chrysler, Ford and General Motors all have winners in terms of the production that they have in their plants.

But having said all of that, with our manufacturing sector in the auto sector doing well, the rest of our manufacturing sector has lost a dramatic number of jobs. I might say that even as the economy in the US picks up and our exports pick up, and we're benefiting enormously right now from essentially a 73-cent dollar, it doesn't look like, even with that pickup, in the manufacturing sector we are going to see a significant growth in jobs. We're going to see a growth in output, but it will not be in jobs.

We're seeing that the growth has been in the service sector, and by the way, about a third of the jobs in Ontario are in the service sector. That's where, when I look at the numbers, the job growth, for 1989 to 1993, as I said, we lost 20% of our manufacturing jobs, 200,000 jobs there, we've lost 70,000 of our construction jobs, but it's been in the service sector where we've seen 150,000 in job growth. That's been the growth area.

Now, the challenge we face there of course, as we all know, is that half the service sector jobs are the public sector or the broader public sector jobs. Roughly a million jobs in Ontario are involved in schools, hospitals, universities, social services, all our community services, our municipalities, our police forces, our fire departments and what not. I think all of us here recognize and accept that it's unlikely that we are going to see job growth in that area. As a matter of fact, I think it's fair to say that we will see, at the very best, holding the line on jobs if not a decline in jobs there.

So when I look at what's going to be required to begin to tackle this problem that can only be described as an emergency, I don't see the job growth coming in the manufacturing sector, I'm hopeful some of it will come in the construction sector and it's going to have to be in some of the other areas in the service sector, apart from the public sector.

Also, when I looked at where the problem is geographically in the province, I think it's fair to say that every community is struggling with unemployment. Virtually all of our sectors—many of us spent time in the Lindsay area, and the tourism industry there is working very hard and struggling. But the area where we lost the jobs, where do we think the big job loss occurred from 1989 to 1993, remembering that the rest of Canada has seen job growth and in Ontario we've lost 155,000 jobs? Where did that occur? Where would you think it occurred?

I'll tell you where it occurred. It occurred in the Metropolitan Toronto area: 170,000 jobs have disappeared from the Metropolitan Toronto area. When I say Metropolitan Toronto, I don't mean just the traditional definition of Metropolitan Toronto of Steeles and Etobicoke Creek but the greater Metropolitan Toronto area.

These numbers are important because they are a sign for us of a big problem that we face in the greater Metropolitan Toronto area. As I say, I look at all of Ontario. Over that period of time we've lost 156,000 jobs. In the Metropolitan Toronto area we've lost 170,000 jobs. The rest of Ontario has actually grown by 14,000 jobs, if we follow all of that. Ontario has lost 156,000 jobs, the Metropolitan Toronto area has lost 170,000 and therefore the rest of Ontario has grown by about 14,000.

I point that out because I think one of our challenges in the months and the years ahead is going to be, how do we re-energize the greater Metropolitan Toronto area? I'm hearing from the city of Toronto and the board of trade that there are these incredible battles going on between municipalities in the greater Metropolitan Toronto area competing for businesses, understandable competition, but perhaps in the long haul not productive and perhaps something where we are spending resources on people moving around for reasons that may not make good business sense, because I've heard of people who can save a considerable amount of money by simply moving their business from one municipality to another. We've got to tackle that, and particularly when I see the number I've talked about.

I happen to be from Metropolitan Toronto. As you travel around the province, someone once said the thing that keeps Canada together is that people aren't particularly fond of Ontario and the thing that keeps Ontario together is that people aren't particularly fond of Metropolitan Toronto. Metropolitan Toronto is struggling, and if we let the vibrant metropolitan area stagnate and if we let go unnoticed 170,000 fewer jobs, we are sowing the seeds of—our own destruction is too strong a term, but we are sowing the seeds of some significant and dramatic problems.

Another thing I'd say is that I rather appreciated in last year's budget that the Minister of Finance actually had a chart in the budget—I may not be able to find it right now—that indicated the real unemployment level. In my opinion and the opinion of the ministry officials, there's a reported unemployment level, and in this particular case the budget said the reported unemployment level is around 10.5%.

It said, "Listen, there is another group of people who have simply dropped out." It's fairly easy to estimate the size of that because the labour market should have grown at a certain rate. It's been hardly growing at all. You know they're there, you know the people are there, in my opinion, you know they're there and they want to work, but they've simply become too discouraged and they've dropped out. The real unemployment rate is, without much doubt, running up around the 13% to 14% area.

The reason I'm spending the time on this issue is that I think if we don't collectively find the ways to solve this

problem, we run the risk of spinning our wheels on all the rest of the stuff. I have no doubt in my mind that the reason for the dramatic growth in the social assistance case load is the result of people having difficulty finding jobs.

I've no doubt, by the way, that there are cheats and frauds and all those sorts of things on welfare, but the fundamental reason—we see these people. I see these people every day in my office. I see people come to me who never thought they'd be out of work. It never even entered their minds. As a matter of fact, they have real difficulty dealing with it. I have to say to them, and I hope this won't get me in trouble with people out there who may have different views, "Listen, maybe you should be looking at social assistance." "No, no, I don't want welfare; I don't believe in it." "No, no, maybe you should be looking at social assistance," not that I want to be spending the taxpayers' money, but these people never thought they'd be in this position. As I say, it is a fundamental problem.

1530

It's always difficult to single a group out because then it sounds like other groups aren't that important, but I think particularly of the young people. We look at the statistics that come in here. If we're not careful, they just become statistics, but in behind them, if you look at—when you're in opposition you have time to do these things, so I grab these statistics as they flow in and I analyse them, sometimes trying to score points against the government, hopefully periodically trying to be helpful, but there is no doubt that among our young people, we are making it very, very difficult for them.

Again, the number in February is now close to 20% unemployment among young people, and people who have looked at these statistics will tell you that they are actually substantially higher than that.

I think our challenge is that when you're in government, you're always assuming and hoping and promising that things are going to get better. My fear is that we're wrong on this, that this is not going to work through what I'll call incrementalism; it's not going to work through just tinkering at the edges.

I'm a supporter of the infrastructure plan, by the way. If you remember the debate in the Legislature here, our party supported something that was called Bill 17 which means something only to us in here, but to the people out there, it was a bill designed to help facilitate private sector-public sector partnerships, get on with building some subways and some roads and some things like that, and sewers. We supported it. We had some reservations about it, but we supported it because we felt that on balance it would help to get on with the infrastructure.

Frankly that's not going to be enough. It will be helpful. Psychologically it's good because if I see a crane and I see activity, that's good. That gets the rest of the business community and the rest of the job-creating community feeling good. Clearly the infrastructure program will create several thousand jobs—extremely important—but at the end of the day, it's not going to be enough.



As we begin this debate on what's called interim supply and looking at how we pay our bills, what I'm trying to urge all of us is to, if we can—we can keep our partisan hats on because we'll never change, but I would suggest that we get in behind the numbers and recognize that this is more serious than we are all collectively acknowledging.

The solutions: I think we only solve the problem when we collectively agree on the magnitude of it, and I don't think we've got a consensus on that yet, but if we all were to agree on it, I happen to think we should be setting ourselves a target in this province to substantially lower our unemployment rate from what we have planned right now.

When I say "planned," I mean if you look at the projections that the government puts forward and the projections that most economists put forward, we're looking down to 1997 and the unemployment rate is still over 9%. If we follow the kind of history of these things, and our ability to deliver those numbers, you would say the likelihood of us hitting the 9%—it's likely going to be higher, if I just use the history of what's happened in the province.

I don't think that's either acceptable, nor is it inevitable. I think there is a way, if we could all agree on it, to substantially lower that. It's going to require action on a whole bunch of fronts. I think we're going to have to set a different tone in the province. Again, we conducted what we call a jobs task force, a Liberal jobs task force, and there is the need to change the tone in the province. There is a sense of pessimism out there, and there's a sense in much of the business community that they are not prepared to invest.

I think the second thing we have to do is, we truly do have to find a way to let the economy breathe. There's no doubt in my mind and in most people's minds that our jobs are going to be created through small business, and I think most people in small business truly do feel they're being stifled now. I don't think there's much doubt, to use the jargon, but it's true, that we have to find a way to reinvent many of our programs.

**Mr Sutherland:** What are the specifics?

**Mr Phillips:** Well, the specifics, the member said: There's no doubt that we need to reform the social assistance, and that all I've heard to date from the government—it promised it would have substantial reform—is that it's hired 280 people to go out after welfare cheats. I understand where you're coming from. The public applauds it and I applaud going after people who are cheating, but that's not getting at the fundamental issue you promised. It wasn't my promise I made; it was your promise you made.

**Mr Sutherland:** People want to know where the Liberals stand on it.

**Mr Phillips:** The member across the aisle is saying, "People want to know where Liberals stand on it." What we've said to the government is, you promised to come forward with your social assistance reform. You didn't do it. For whatever reasons, you haven't done it, and if you're not embarrassed by that, that's fine.

The fourth area is, without doubt, the tools that our business community have need help. The banks: I mean, it's quite fashionable to bash the banks these days from almost every quarter, and I think it is fair to say that our banks have not been as helpful to the changing economy as they should have been. They're playing catch-up now; they're working hard to do that. But in the meantime, I've hardly talked to a small business person who has not had a tough experience with a bank. As I say, perhaps I can understand how they got there, but we have to find the tools, through the banks, the credit unions, the trust companies and other tools, that people have access to the necessary capital: operating capital and equity and debt and all those sorts of things.

I might also say that tools in the future will be kind of the hard infrastructure stuff—the roads, the sewers—and the soft infrastructure stuff, which we all talk about but we've got to make absolutely sure we're actually doing it, because I look at some of the jurisdictions that are now competing aggressively against us, and they brag about their hard infrastructure and their soft infrastructure.

The fifth area is, without doubt, I think we have an enormous resource in the people of Ontario and in the institutions that are there: our colleges, our universities, our elementary and our secondary schools and the resources we put behind them. But I think all of us would agree we haven't focused on that well. We've asked our institutions to try to be in many respects all things to all people. I don't think we've even begun to scratch the surface in helping to take advantage of the asset that is our diverse society.

I was at a banquet recently. There was quite a large group from the Chinese business community there. In that room was an individual representing a company that had just bought all the Stouffer resorts from around the world, and another individual who owned the casinos at—I think it's called Macao, near Hong Kong; just enormously successful business people, and I just use those as two small examples.

1540

What I'm afraid of is we're letting time go by. I think that's an asset we've had, because we've believed and we've been able to attract significant business people literally from around the world to come and live in Ontario, but we haven't found a way, for the wellbeing of all Ontario, to harness that.

It's not enough just to simply say, "Listen, there is a problem." In my opinion, the problem on the job front is huge and we're not going to solve it. We're tinkering at the edges. As I said when I began my remarks, the problem is when you're in government it's always difficult, because you are hoping and planning for it to get better even when it's not. When you're in opposition, you give a speech like this and many people say, "Oh, it's just a partisan speech designed to score some political points."

That for me is the issue, that if we don't find a way to really get at it in a very, very significant way—I don't know who the good models are for us to emulate. I happen to think probably Frank McKenna's done not a

bad job in New Brunswick. There are things he could do better no doubt, but I think he's done many of the things that I think we're going to have to do here in Ontario.

The first issue I want to get on the table when we're debating interim supply and the challenges we have of meeting the bills in this province is that if we don't tackle this one, the rest is just far more difficult; not impossible, but far more difficult.

The second thing I want to talk a little bit about is the finances of the province. Because I may not have a chance at the end, I wanted to talk about one subaspect of the finances of the province that some of the members in the Legislature worked on during the session between when the House sat in December and when we came back in March, and that's the whole issue of the underground economy.

The committee completed its report on it and I thought it was a relatively good piece of work, recognizing that we are trying to deal with a huge problem with a limited amount of time and resources available.

The things I learned from that study on the underground economy are, firstly, there is no doubt that it is large and growing. I don't think there is any doubt that as we look at the revenues of the province, the revenues have been significantly impacted by it. My view is that the underground economy without much doubt is at least 8% of the economy, probably approaching 10%. If you accept those numbers, the province is losing probably \$3 billion to \$4 billion a year in revenue.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** Largely due to the GST.

**Mr Phillips:** The member said, "Largely due to the GST." I don't think that's the case. The GST, there's no doubt, was a stimulus for another spurt in the growth of it.

I have reluctantly concluded that for many this is actually a tax revolt. I went on two open-line shows to talk about our report, and the first time I was totally unprepared for the calls. Maybe I shouldn't have been totally unprepared, but I went thinking the discussion would be around: "Listen, this is a problem. I understand why it's a problem. Can we begin to look at solutions for it?" To me, we all have a collective interest in solving this, because it's growing substantially and it's essentially unfair. It essentially allows people to make their own mind up about how much taxes and whether they want to pay them.

But anyway, the point I'm making is that when I got on the open-line show, without exception—I think without exception; certainly I can't remember one—virtually every call that came in said, "I'm participating in the underground economy, I'm happy about it and I'm going to keep doing it." The reason they used, by the way, was, "You politicians are mispending my tax dollars so I'm going to do whatever I can to teach you a lesson."

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** Was one of those phone-ins NDP Noon? I think it was, wasn't it?

**Mr Phillips:** No. My point is this: We have an epidemic on our hands here. It is growing substantially,

to the best of my determination, and the biggest loss we have in the revenue is in the income tax area. People think it's on booze and on tobacco—it was on tobacco—and on home renovation GST and PST, but the biggest loss is in the income tax area because people are simply not reporting their income. I wanted to mention that one.

As I say, the committee concluded its report. I don't think we've begun yet to find the solution on this. The problem we're going to run into is that the longer it goes without a collective solution on it, the more we run into incredible unfairness, because if you can select when you choose to pay your taxes and when you choose not to pay your taxes, I think we're into quite a dangerous environment. There are some recommendations for solutions. I think the ministry has 120 days in which to reply and I'm looking forward to the reply.

I wanted to talk more specifically around the state of the finances of the province, because this is the second big issue of the province and how we're going to have to begin to tackle the challenges of meeting the bills that we're going to have to pay once we pass this interim supply motion.

Again, I don't think there's any doubt that we've dug a very deep fiscal hole in the last three years. I don't think there's any doubt that if Premier Rae could turn the clock back to their first budget, the 1991 budget, he would do it differently now. I don't think there's any doubt but that if you could turn it back, you wouldn't be saying you're going to spend your way out of the recession. I don't think there's any doubt that would have been a restraint budget instead of the budget it was. But you can't turn the clock back, and now we've seen three consecutive years of deficits over \$10 billion.

What that essentially means for people out there is that we're spending 25% more than we're raising, and as we all know in our personal lives, you can only do that for a very short period of time. We're running the debt up substantially. As I think most people in Ontario now realize, when the NDP came in the debt of the province was around \$40 billion. When's March 31? In two more days, as of the day after tomorrow, the debt will have doubled. That's the end of the fiscal year. That's when the debt of the province will have reached \$80 billion.

1550

We've seen, over a four-year period, the debt of the province doubling from \$40 billion to \$80 billion. The problem you start getting into with that is that the debt servicing costs begin to eat up an enormous portion of the budget. As you all know, it's now well over \$7 billion, and we've been fortunate that we've been living with some comparatively low interest rates; that's been helpful. And I happen to think the province has done not a bad job of managing its borrowing. It's a heck of a lot of money to borrow, but I think it's done not a bad job of borrowing it; has managed the cost of borrowing this amount of money about as well as you can manage it.

None the less, when you double the debt, what it really means is that people out there, every family out there—and this is one way to think about it, because this is reality—each family in Ontario now owes about \$13,000 more in debt in the province than when Premier Rae got



elected. The fact is that the interest has to be paid on that. I think many people have just assumed, "Somehow or other, someone else will pay the interest."

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** Does that include the debt you left us?

**Mr Phillips:** The member asks, "Does that include the debt you left?" It's interesting that the Provincial Auditor says there's been only one balanced budget in 25 years in the province, and that was the final year the Liberals were in power. Actually, I'll read it. This is from the Provincial Auditor. I think people in the province believe the Provincial Auditor; they are far more sceptical of politicians. What the Provincial Auditor said in his 1991 report is, "Ontario has had only one surplus in the last 20 years (year ended March 31, 1990.)" That's what the auditor said. When did Bob Rae take over? September 1990. Only one surplus in 20 years in the province; that's what the auditor said.

As I said, I think the mistake Bob Rae made was his first budget, the 1991 budget, when he said he would spend his way out of the recession. Spending went up 14% when inflation was running at 2%, and he's been playing catch-up literally ever since.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** Did you guys call for restraint at that time?

**Mr Phillips:** The member asks, did we call for restraint? Actually, we did call for restraint. I remember Bob Rae would say, "The Liberals weren't forthcoming with us about the need for restraint." Just for the people who are viewing here, each year a Legislative committee looks at the budget. What did the NDP say when it was in opposition, leading up to the budget, when the Liberals were saying it was time for restraint? This is what Bob Rae said.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The Liberals weren't saying that at that time. They were crowing about a so-called balanced budget.

**The Deputy Speaker:** There's a period of questions and comments after. Please.

**Mr Phillips:** No, no. Mr Wildman may have even signed this report. Here's what the NDP were saying when they were in opposition just before the election: "The Ontario government"—that was the Ontario Liberal government—"has reacted to predictions of an economic slowdown by dropping its Liberal pretence and is showing its true conservative nature. The Liberal government is now spreading the message that 1990 will be a year of fiscal, financial restraint." That's what we were saying, but Mr Wildman signed the report saying: "No, no, no. This isn't a time for fiscal restraint. This is a time to spend."

**Hon Mr Wildman:** That's when you were saying there was a balanced budget, and we believed you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Minister.

**Mr Phillips:** Mr Wildman may not like to hear this, but we were saying, in your own words, Mr Wildman, "The Liberal government is now spreading the message that 1990 will be a year of financial restraint."

**Hon Mr Wildman:** And we thought there was a balanced budget.

**Mr Phillips:** Well, there you are, and now you want to shift ground. That's what we were saying, and you acknowledged it, so you can't have it both ways.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The lesson is, never believe the Liberals when they say there is a balanced budget.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. We have questions and comments after the debate. I would ask you, I would beg you, as a matter of fact, to take advantage of that, but please don't interrupt.

**Mr Phillips:** I've obviously touched a nerve. I think they're still bitter that they won. He's never forgiven us.

But, Mr Wildman, don't listen to me. Listen to what the Provincial Auditor says. He says, "Ontario has had only one surplus in the last 20 years (year ended March 31, 1990)." Then the auditor goes on to ask, why was there a \$3-billion deficit? The auditor spelled it out exactly.

One thing was that for good reason, the government, the NDP, Bob Rae, decided to write a bunch of things off. How did we get to the \$3-billion deficit? The auditor explains it perfectly. First, remember, everybody, there was only one surplus: the year ending March 31, 1990. You came in a few months later and took over the books. What happened? The auditor explains how we get to the \$3-billion deficit. Maybe you should read it some time.

The auditor says it was quite understandable that when the budget was prepared, it was expected for the second year in a row that there would be a surplus. Here's what happened:

"The extent of the recession, which was obviously not foreseen at the time of the budget," dropped revenues by \$1 billion. That's number one. Okay, you got that.

Number two, special payments were required primarily because of the social assistance case load increase. You understand that.

Third, and this is good politics, the NDP government decided to write off \$924 million in special payments, \$200 million to the teachers' pension. It wasn't due until the next year, but you've got to get the \$3-billion deficit. You prepaid \$200 million. Do you understand that? That was \$200 million. Urban Transportation Development Corp, a \$400-million loan, not due; you wrote it off. And then our favourite: the SkyDome, of course, which was completely written off, \$321 million.

The reason I go through all of that is because I'm not sure all the NDP members appreciate it: a balanced budget, only one with a surplus in 20 years, the year ending March 31, 1990. You all came in a few months later, took it over. How did you get to the \$3 billion? The auditor explains it in detail.

I know it's hard. I know you'd love to blame the Liberals for leaving you things, that it's not your fault. Don't take my word for it. Read the Provincial Auditor's report.

So I go back to the challenges with the finances, the fact that we now have seen three credit downgrades. When you took over, the province had a solid AAA credit rating, no doubt about that. A year later, it's downgraded to AA+; a year later, it's downgraded to AA; a year later, it's downgraded to AA-.

The province can sustain a AA-. If we lose one more credit rating, we have a problem. I will do everything I can to make sure that—whatever I can do, but I will be as supportive of the government as I can. My feeling is that we will not see a downgrade. If we see a downgrade into single A, we have a major problem on our hands, because we can borrow money reasonably at a AA rating, but if you move into the single A, we have a significant problem, so we all have a huge interest in ensuring that not happen, and when the budget comes out in a few weeks, I'm hopeful it won't.

1600

But my feeling on the budget is that, without much doubt, the government is going to put together a budget that will show a deficit in the \$7.5-billion to \$8.5-billion range. I don't think there's much doubt about that. We're going through the ritualistic dance of, "It's going to be real bad. It's going to be this, it's going to be that," but I don't think there's much doubt that we'll show a deficit in the \$7.5-billion to \$8.5-billion range.

The problem we're going to run into is that, in my opinion, there are several very questionable accounting techniques being used to get to that number. If there is a problem with the rating agencies, it will be here, as people get in behind the numbers.

I will just go through a few of the things that worry me. I've reached the stage where, in my opinion, the reported budget number is important, but it doesn't come close to telling an accurate picture of a year-to-year comparison. I want to run through a variety of things I see in this year's budget and next year's budget that I think undermine the credibility of the province and, as people see through them, run the risk of putting at risk our credit rating, primarily because if people begin to have doubts about how much they can trust the books, they begin to have doubts about whether they want to loan money. I'll just go through a few of these things, because they're important and because I think they will eventually see the light.

On March 25, the government sold \$425 million worth of GO trains—I think the deal closed then; I've seen no public announcement, but I'm sure it is—and it has showed that as revenue. They said: "We've sold \$425 million of GO trains. We got \$425 million of revenue." That is not what happened. They didn't sell the GO trains. They just refinanced them. Essentially, they took a loan out against the GO trains. They got someone to loan them \$425 million, and the government said, "We will repay you over a period of time through lease costs and then we will buy back those trains."

Here's the problem: If you show \$425 million worth of revenue but it's really a loan, we are absolutely fooling ourselves. It would be like, on a personal basis, going to the bank and having them ask, "How much money do you make a year?" and you say, "Well, I make this amount, plus, by the way, I've just taken out another loan on my car, so I'm counting that as revenue." That's not revenue. That is simply a loan. That's \$425 million this year.

You see all these government buildings, the Frost building and all these government buildings. What's

going to happen to them?

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I bet you they'll sell them.

**Mr Phillips:** That's right. They're not selling them, but they will pretend they're selling them. They're essentially simply taking out a loan against them, and they're going to do the same thing with a bunch of computers around here. The problem we get into is that that's not revenue, that is simply a loan, and showing it as revenue is transparent.

On the expenditure side, this one is huge. The province spends \$600 million every year on school, hospital, college and university capital, and it's historically been in the form of a grant. Now the government is saying to school boards and municipalities and hospitals and colleges and universities: "We will still provide you that money, the \$600 million a year, don't worry about that, but we don't want to show it on our books. You go borrow the money, and you tell whomever you borrow the money from not to worry, because we will commit to repay 100% of the principal and interest on that."

Now, in the budget book they call it loan-based financing. When I first saw the term "loan-based financing," I thought: "This is great. The province is going to get the money back. They're just loaning it." Well, it is exactly the opposite. What the government officials told me is that in five years there will be \$3 billion worth of debt on someone else's books and in 10 years there will be \$5.5 billion worth of debt on those books, 100% owed by the province but not shown as debt; hidden somewhere.

My belief is that this year, the year that's ending in roughly two days, they will show roughly \$800 million this year and next year I understand they will do well over \$1.4 billion the same way.

The third big thing they've done is on the pension thing. I think members recall that at the end of December we passed some legislation here which was amazing legislation in some respects, because as the members know, in the teachers' pension fund there is an unfunded liability right now of roughly \$8 billion. The teachers don't need to worry about this because 100% of this is the responsibility of the province, the taxpayers of Ontario. But what the government did was say, "We are going to take a three-and-a-half-year holiday from making any payments against that \$8-billion unfunded liability."

By the way, furthermore, the government passed legislation exempting itself from what's called the Pension Benefits Act so it could take \$140 million out of the teachers' pension. If you hadn't passed the legislation, it would have been illegal, because you cannot take money out of a pension fund with an unfunded liability. You all remember the famed Conrad Black situation where he tried to take money out of a pension fund that had a surplus. In this case, we took \$140 million out of a pension that has an \$8-billion unfunded liability.

When I explored this, one of the reasons was that essentially we could borrow money from that at 8% and it's costing 8.25% to borrow money, as they say, on the



street, so we're borrowing money more cheaply. But we're not showing that anywhere as a debt or a liability. It is essentially, in my opinion, borrowing roughly \$500 million a year from the unfunded liability and letting it run up.

The reason I raise that one is that I think one of the things all of us are going to want to watch over the next few months is, just what are we doing with our pension funds? I don't know the details of the Hydro deal, but from what I've read in the paper, part of the settlement there may be looking at some reduced contribution to the pension fund. I raised the question in the Legislature here last week about whether the government had any intention to fund its 1994-95 budget plan through reduced contribution to the pension fund, and the answer I got back was quite guarded, I thought, quite craftily worded to avoid answering my question.

As I said, I don't want to alarm the teachers, because the public has 100% responsibility for funding it, so they shouldn't be worried. My worry is that we are going to go three and a half years with no payment into it and then suddenly we have an annual payment that kicks in of \$600 million or \$700 million a year. By the way, this unfunded liability goes to almost \$14 billion before it starts to tail off. This is really big money.

I'm going through these things because I don't think we should be surprised if, when the budget comes out and it has a deficit of \$8.1 billion or \$8.2 billion, the financial community says: "Whoa, wait a minute. Let's look at the real number." In my opinion, there's going to be probably another \$500 million worth of government buildings that will be "sold"—not sold at all; they will just take out a mortgage on them and lease back. And I gather there may be some computers and planes, hundreds of millions of dollars of them.

1610

I also raise this question: You know how we've all now moved to five-year drivers' licences; it used to be a three-year driver's licence and we now have a five-year driver's licence. If this were a business—and all the business people out there will know this—and you sold someone a five-year something or other, you couldn't show all five years of revenue in one year. You'd have to say, "Well, I earned part of the revenue in one year," one year, one year, one year. The government is going to do it differently. They'll take all the revenue in the year they collect it. So, surprise, surprise, we've now moved to five-year drivers' licences. In 1993, 1994 and 1995 all the revenue will come in and then there will be no revenue in 1996 or 1997.

I'm also signalling that the government is moving to set up—it has already set them up—a large number of crown corporations, or the jargon around here is schedule 4 agencies. There will be roughly 3,500 people moved from the government payroll off into these agencies. It's a neat move because then it looks like, boy, we're really managing things well. We've got 3,500 fewer people. They're just moved on to a different book; in my opinion, allowing all sorts of difficulties in comparing what is the government really doing year to year and how much progress are we really making year to year.

That, by the way, is the reason I'm raising these things. I understand what the government is trying to do. It's trying to say: "Boy, we're making great progress against reducing the deficit. Look at all the things we've done." But in my opinion, if the public aren't being given the facts and the public don't know what the real state of the finances is, they are unable to deal with the implications of it.

As a matter of fact, what did the Provincial Auditor say about the way the government reports its books? I don't know whether many of the government members have looked at this or not, but for the first time in the history of the province, when the Provincial Auditor commented on the books that closed a year ago, the Provincial Auditor refused to give an unqualified opinion. In other words, he said, "I'm not giving this a clean bill of health."

He also went on to say, "The public are not now being provided the financial information required to help them understand and assess the financial position and results of the government." In other words, he signalled clearly to us that the way the government is reporting its finances doesn't give the public the financial information required to help them understand and assess the financial position and results of the government.

I've been pushing for the government to report its books in a different way. I might say the third party has been doing the same thing. I thought we had the agreement of the government to do that. I thought the budget for 1994-95 would be prepared in the way the auditor wanted it.

I got a carefully worded response back that fooled me because it said, "Yes, we will prepare the public accounts in the way the Provincial Auditor wants them." Because I'm not sure I understand all the jargon, I said: "This is great. The budget will be prepared for 1994-95 the way the auditor wants it." The answer back was, "The public accounts will be prepared in accordance with the way that the auditor wants them."

I finally found out that what that means is, the public accounts will be reported when? September 30, 1995. So, surprise, surprise, the books will be prepared the way the auditor wants them, but they won't be done until September 30, 1995. We all know what will have happened by that time.

I'm spending the time on this because, in my opinion, there is no doubt what's going on behind the scenes, and that is, "How can we get our books"—I call it "juggled," and I hope I'm not being too extreme there—"juggled so we can report a deficit as low as possible?"

I've outlined those areas. What we're talking about there is roughly \$3 billion: \$1 billion worth of revenue and roughly \$2 billion worth of expenditures. If we don't identify those and understand those and recognize that they are the real expenditures—if the books had been kept in the same way year to year to year, they would have had to have been in the books—we're fooling ourselves.

What that means is that I think it has several implications. One is, as I say, that the financial community will

see through these and we'll have the worst of all worlds. They will include them in any of their calculations but they will have lost confidence in the full disclosure of the Ontario finances.

There's where we run the risk of a downgrading. I hope it won't happen. I personally think that the ministry officials are working closely with the rating agencies. I suspect the government will understand what will be required to ensure we don't lose our rating, but if we do, I think it will be as a result of these sorts of things.

On the question of why we are struggling the way we're struggling, there's no doubt the revenue has been hard hit. I talked earlier about the underground economy and the belief the committee had that we could be looking at \$3 billion to \$4 billion worth of revenue in the province lost to the underground economy. By the way, that hasn't all occurred overnight. I think there's always been an underground economy, there's no doubt about that, but one of the people earlier indicated that the GST stimulated it further, there's no doubt about that, and we have looked at substantial revenue losses.

The second thing I think that's hurt the revenue is that maybe what many people have worried about has actually happened, and that is that we've hit the wall. Just for everyone's information, in 1990-91, the tax revenue in the province was \$33.5 billion. Taxes went up each of the last three years by roughly \$1 billion. Normally, one would have expected tax revenue to have grown by \$3 billion. What actually has happened in the year that's just ending two days from now is that tax revenue has actually dropped by \$2.5 billion.

That's very dramatic, that tax revenue in 1990-91 was \$33.5 billion, taxes went up by \$3 billion, you would have expected tax revenue to be \$36 billion to \$37 billion. Tax revenue, according to the government's figures, in 1993-94 will be \$31.2 billion. In other words, tax revenue was supposed to go up like that. Tax revenue actually has dropped, for a variety of reasons. The tax revenue engine, as I've said before, is in the ditch and the wheels are spinning.

What has the government turned to? It's turned to all sorts of things, as I've talked about before: selling GO trains and then leasing them back—it's no sale at all; it's just remortgaging the GO trains; selling the Frost Building and then leasing it back. I have a note here saying that the government plans to sell \$500 million worth of jails and courthouses and lease them back. It's strange that it would sell jails and then lease them back. That's what the plans are. Plus, of course, the government is turning over every stone looking for revenue.

1620

I was amazed when we were at committee, when we were talking about photo-radar and what a revenue generator that is. I couldn't believe it, actually. We were told there by the senior ministry officials that each photo-radar machine in the province will generate, if you can believe this, \$15 million a year in revenue. As the Chair of the committee said, better than slot machines—\$15 million a machine.

I have no doubt that as the government looks, as I say,

to turn over every stone for sources of revenue, we're going to see some of the most ingenious plans to generate more and more revenue. There's no doubt in my mind that gambling is seen as a big cash cow, with casinos all over Ontario now. We have the casino opening in Windsor, and I think it will do very well. I think the cars will be lined up for a long way coming across the border.

I don't have any doubt that there'll be an incredible pressure from all sorts of communities. I also don't have much doubt that throughout North America we're going to see a proliferation, as they say, of casinos, and then the real challenge will be who survives 10 years from now. But in the meantime, we're going to see an incredible proliferation of them.

By the way, on that one, I wish the government had accepted our amendment to make certain that the public, in the end, isn't on the hook for the debt of those casinos. They're going to cost \$250 million to build, I gather. We proposed an amendment that would have said: "Listen, if the private sector wants to get involved in these things, great. Build them, great. If they can make money at them, great. But you're held accountable for the debt."

*Interjection.*

**Mr Phillips:** Someone has said, "Sure, like SkyDome." That's exactly my point. I think the public is delighted to have a facility like Skydome. They believe it's a great facility—it's brought tourism to Ontario, it's been a great economic boom—but they're not happy, in the end, about having to pick up the debt on that. That's why we proposed that amendment on the casinos, and I wish that it had passed.

In any event, my point is this: I think the government has heard the message that Ontario is taxed out. I think the figures confirm that, when we've actually seen tax revenue over a four-year period drop by \$2 billion. There are a few extenuating circumstances, but the direction is clear. But what this government is going to do is turn to every other possible source of revenue—from casinos, to fees, to selling off government buildings, as I said before, and then leasing them right back, selling the jails and leasing them back, all sorts of things—to artificially, in my opinion, inflate the revenue.

The reason I've gone through these is that there is no doubt that we are in a deep fiscal hole. There's no doubt, as the budget comes up, that the government will present a budget in two or three weeks that will report a deficit significantly lower than the 1993-94 deficit. For anybody who follows this stuff, we run on a fiscal year basis which ends the end of March. We're just about within two days of finishing our fiscal year, and the government will present its budget for the next fiscal, the year that starts on April 1, 1994. There's no doubt that the government will present a budget with a deficit probably \$1.5 billion lower than the deficit for the year that's just ended.

My point is that we all have a responsibility to get in behind the numbers and to determine: Are we making progress against our deficit or not? My concern is that, as I look at the numbers, it's questionable.

This allows me to return to my opening theme, and



that is that we can deal with our finances. I think there are solutions to our fiscal challenges. One of them, quite clearly, is to get the economy going. There are limitations in the end to being able to save your way out of this. I think we also have to see some good economic growth.

The problem we're running into right now is, this is what a lot of people out there say: "Well, I don't feel any recovery." The reason people don't feel any recovery is that even at the end of 1994, the Ontario economy will be just back to where it was in 1989 in terms of output, or to use the jargon that people use, "gross domestic product." But the output of Ontario at the end of 1994 will have just crawled its way back up to where it was in 1989. That's why people aren't feeling the recovery, and that's why we're struggling with jobs and our finances. We have to get the economy rolling.

The key to that, in my opinion, is finding ways that we see jobs created. Key to that are the things I talked about earlier: setting the tone, finding ways that we allow our businesses to breathe again, finding ways that we truly do, as they say, reinvent the tools, the government tools. We're trying to operate a 1990s economy with a 1960s style of government apparatus. We truly do have to find ways that we provide the tools for our business community to operate and to improve the human skills of the people of the province, help it improve the human skills.

I'm pleased to participate in the debate on supply. The challenge we have on supply, of course, is that the bills will be paid. The Legislature will pass supply, but in behind the challenges on supply is a real fiscal problem we have on our hands, and for me the biggest problem is that we are simply not seeing jobs created in this province nearly quickly enough.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Are there any questions or comments?

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I'd like to congratulate the member for Scarborough-Agincourt. He always gives us an enlightened speech on this topic. We've heard it before and I think that—

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** Yes, we've heard it before, many times.

**Mr Tilson:** We have heard it before, and I would encourage him to say it over and over. One of the issues he has raised which we should take to heart is the issue of credit rating. I'm not quite as optimistic as the member for Scarborough-Agincourt is. I believe that we do have serious problems. I don't think the foreign investor or the investor in this province is going to take with credence many of the things that this government is doing. The Treasurer has used the George Bush speech of, "No new taxes, read my lips," and that may or may not be the case. We've certainly seen in the last budget how more and more fees than we've ever seen have been put forward.

Clearly, the fudging of the books is an issue that the member for Scarborough-Agincourt has summarized in great detail. He's certainly dead on on the deceiving that's been going on by this government with respect to where the financial position of this province really is. There's no question we're really in deep trouble, and the issue of

the fudging of the books is a prime example. It's as if the Treasurer is going to stand up with the next budget, which presumably is next month some time, and say that this province is really on the road to recovery. We know, and the member for Scarborough-Agincourt knows, that's simply not the case. The foreign investor simply won't believe all the tricks this Treasurer is using.

I congratulate the member for Scarborough-Agincourt and I look forward to hearing more of this type of debate as we proceed through this motion.

**Mr Sutherland:** I listened to the member for Scarborough-Agincourt and I must say that he has these comments down pat very well. They're the common concerns that he raises. He's very good at raising the problems. Where he's not very good, and where the Liberal Party seems to be lacking, is in identifying solutions. They want to talk about: "We need the new tools. We need to let business grow."

I watched the leader of the official opposition on Focus Ontario on Saturday. She was asked very direct questions about specific concerns. She complained about our tuition increases. All she could say was "a moderate tuition increase." She talked about reinventing government. They talk in these nice frameworks, these nice little words. Where's the substance?

The people of Ontario know that we're in very difficult times. They know that it takes strong leadership, that it takes tough decisions to get us out of this, and they know that some of the things that this government has had to do are very difficult. They want to find out where the other parties stand. They want to hear some real, substantive policy ideas and suggestions. Once again, we have not heard any from the Liberal Party.

Let's talk about some new tools that this government has come forward with. Let's look at our agricultural investment strategy. Let's look at rural GICs. Let's look at personal loan-mortgage guarantees. Let's look at what we've done on community development with loan share and community development corporations—they're some of the new tools—and labour-sponsored venture capital, worker ownership. No one of them is going to solve the problem, but they are specific new tools that this government, and I repeat this government, has come forward that no other government has come forward with in the past, supporting communities to allow us to get our economy going. The people of Ontario want to know where the Liberal Party stands on issues.

1630

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** What I find most interesting is that after I guess about an hour and 15 minutes of debate by our Finance critic, the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, all we can hear from the government back bench are attempts at criticizing him. It's like this is the Treasurer-in-waiting.

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** No way.

**Mr Mahoney:** That's what I hear and that's what we hear every day. It's beginning to feel a lot like government. It's really quite a fascinating thing.

I want to congratulate the member for Scarborough-Agincourt. He's probably somewhat modest, but he puts

out a document called Treasury Watch, which is an analysis of the province's financial position. I guess on a monthly basis, the analysis is done. I have it on some good authority that one of the people who reads Treasury Watch with careful consideration is the current Minister of Finance for the province of Ontario. In fact, in responding to questions by our critic, the Minister of Finance has often made reference to the fact that the critic seems to have a handle on the finances of the province and a clear understanding of them, unlike many of the members opposite.

What the members opposite fail to understand is that you have driven business confidence right out of this province. You have taxed more than anyone in history—to the point, as the member for Scarborough-Agincourt has pointed out, that the underground economy is becoming the predominant economy in this province. People are doing whatever they can to avoid the taxman. The taxman cometh and people simply go underground in trying to avoid it. You have killed business initiative in this province and you've killed revenue.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** We have time for one more question or comment.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I just want to comment briefly on the member for Scarborough-Agincourt's remarks that he made in the House this afternoon with regard to the finances of the province, with regard to the bill that's before us, the resolution to pay the employees of the province from the end of March.

I've been in this House some time, and it is only in the last two or three years that we have never had the opportunity to have a real debate on any budgetary policies or any budget that this administration has brought forward.

I think it's long overdue that when the next budget is brought before this Legislature the members of this Legislature should have the opportunity to deal with that budget. The member has indicated many facts and figures with regard to the budgetary policies of this government, and when I look at some of the budgetary policies of the government, and I read *An Agenda for People*, it says, "Instead our platform for this election represents a new beginning for Ontario, an agenda for people that begins the work of making our tax system fair, restoring our environment, protecting people and their jobs, alleviating poverty, making homes more affordable and building a stronger northern Ontario."

I haven't seen any of that take place since this administration has been in power. They said they want to make our tax system fairer. You ask anyone out there if the taxing system of this administration is fair; they will tell you it's not, because everything they do they have to put their hand in their pocket. When you look at the amount of tax increases that have been brought in, and the member for Scarborough-Agincourt had indicated very strongly with regard to the credit rating of the province, how we're having trouble with that, when we look at the budgetary policies and we look at the next budget that's coming, we hope we will have the opportunity to have five to eight days' debate in this Legislature on that very budget.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Scarborough-Agincourt has two minutes to reply.

**Mr Phillips:** I always get a bit of a kick out of the member for Oxford, because he will say, "Well, show us your solutions; give us your recommendations," so then when we do them—I remember the underground economy. We had a great debate on the underground economy, and as soon as the opposition came forward with recommendations, both the Liberal Party and the Conservatives, unanimously the NDP voted against them.

**Mr Sutherland:** That's not true.

**Mr Phillips:** I remember going around the province on the first NDP budget. We had lots of suggestions for the budget. What happened on that? It was an orchestrated activity designed just simply to do window dressing.

I can remember here in the Legislature having many suggestions on youth unemployment. Actually, I think in the end, reluctantly, the NDP finally accepted some of those recommendations.

I strongly urged you, I begged you to not do what you did with playing games with the books on the pensions. What happened? The Provincial Auditor caught you, and you were warned about this by us, warned about it. The Provincial Auditor said, "I am not going to give an unqualified opinion on the books, because you're playing games with the books."

I can go through recommendation after recommendation for them. What they don't want to hear is that you didn't listen to those recommendations.

For my colleague from Dufferin-Peel, I hope you're wrong on the credit rating, because if we do get downgraded to A, we'll have a very serious problem of raising funds.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** I enjoy the opportunity to debate interim supply because it's one of the few opportunities in the Legislature that you can get an opportunity, unencumbered, with little in the way of rules and regulations and strict adherence to the issues at hand or the legislation before you, to deal with the issues that affect the people in the province of Ontario specifically.

I would like to discuss the finances from I suppose day one, when this government took over, to today. From the day that the socialists got elected in this province, the difficulty that I think they've had is in picking a plan and sticking to that plan. I understand that there would be some concern over there, but let's review how many plans this government's had with respect to the fiscal and financial concerns in the province of Ontario.

**Mr Sutherland:** We adapt. We don't stay in the 1760s like the Conservatives.

**Mr Stockwell:** I will say this—I see the member for Oxford. I recall sitting in this Legislature the day their Treasurer, Mr Floyd Laughren, brought in their first budget. I believe it was April of 1991. They brought in their first budget and there were some puffed-out chests and there was a lot of tub-thumping about the fact that this government had decided, in its wisdom, that in April



1991 this government was going to be completely different from any other government in the provinces in this country and, again, the federal government. They were choosing at that time to fight the recession instead of fighting the deficit.

There were a lot of Tory debates, and again "Hear, hear" was from that side of the House a common cry as the Treasurer read into the record the government's need to fight the recession and not the deficit. At that time, the deficit the year before stood in the \$3.2-billion range. They brought in their 1991 budget and immediately called that the deficit would be \$9.9 billion.

I remember that day very well, because I was the critic for our party. I recall going across the street to the lockup, reading that budget and thinking to myself that no government could have made such a gross misjudgement with respect to the economy, the finances and the recession. I vividly recall thinking, "This budget is completely and thoroughly out of control," that to call for a \$10-billion deficit in the times we were just entering, a very serious recessionary spiral, was only going to cause this government severe handicap and headache in years to come.

1640

Subsequent to the date the Treasurer announced that budget, I stood in the House on a few occasions—I was rather animated, I admit—and said to the Treasurer: "Are you sure that this is what you think is going to work? Are you sure you want to institutionalize a \$10-billion deficit? Are you certain that this is the road you want to go down at this time to, hopefully, prop up that sagging recession?"

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** You had more self-control than you have now.

**Mr Stockwell:** It could be said. Maybe I didn't have a lot of self-control, because I was so vehemently opposed to the approach this Treasurer had adopted, along with his cabinet, the Premier and caucus, to fight this recession: taking a \$3.2-billion deficit to \$10 billion.

Ultimately, the \$10-billion deficit was the first in a series of miscalculations for which the Treasurer became famed as Spot-on Floyd. He became famous for miscalculating the deficit, and the first year was the very beginning of that typical, historic miscalculation. He said the deficit would be \$9.9 billion and it came in significantly higher. I think it came in around \$12 billion.

I recall that. Why I refer at this time back to that date is because the plan of this government at that time was to fight the recession, not the deficit. Why I comment on that with respect to the interim supply is because the mistake was made. The government didn't realize it had made a mistake until it was much too late. I think even they, maybe in their quieter moments, in sober thought, will admit today, some of them, that maybe the deficit at that level, for that amount of money, may have been an error in judgement, because a couple of short years later, they simply got off that track or that game plan they'd established for themselves and decided to move off in a completely different and new direction.

That was the day they decided about their three-legged

stool. We all remember the three-legged-stool explanation that Mr Laughren came up with. The member for Beaches-Woodbine also often referred to the three-legged stool. I often thought they were missing the legs, that it was just "stool."

It seemed to me they had gone off on a completely different track. That track was that they now had realized their mistake in that first budget. They realized they'd institutionalized a double-digit deficit yearly, and they discovered, lo and behold, much to their chagrin, that there were people out there who thought this was a huge mistake, not the least of whom were the lending institutions, not the least of whom were the bond-rating agencies. They thought this was such a huge mistake, that the bureaucracy had a never-satisfied appetite for money, that they decided to take track two.

Track two was to somehow rein in this deficit and rein in the spending. Now we're on plan two, and this is where they probably start off with a reasonably good idea. Granted, they made that huge mistake in the beginning and it's not really sure they can fix it with their new plan, but in my mind and I believe in the minds of most of my caucus, at least it was something they were doing that I believed was helpful and healthy to recover in this province of Ontario.

They institutionalized the \$2-billion social contract. I didn't agree with the \$2 billion in new taxes, I didn't think that was a proper route to go, but at least they said, "We're going to capture \$2 billion of that money we gave away a year or two ago and bring it back in," rein in the salaries, rein in the expenditures, rein in the revenue and try to bring in a deficit that was a little more realistic.

The difficulty they had is that they didn't even handle that right.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Chris, you've driven away all your colleagues.

**Mr Stockwell:** No, they're all listening.

They didn't even do that right, because we know—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** I will say to the member for Middlesex that I heard that comment. I think it's thoroughly unparliamentary and you should probably retract it.

That was the mistake they made. The \$2-billion recovery would have been successful had they simply done what I stood in this House and asked them to do. Rather than try to negotiate days off and rather than try to negotiate time off and try to negotiate 5% away, they should have simply said, right across the board, a 5% reduction, no time off. We know full well that a lot of this money they claim to have saved is simply deferred.

We know police officers are going to have to get their money because they deferred the time they would have been off. You can't allow a police car in Metropolitan Toronto to go out at night without two officers; that's the rule. When one of them goes off duty, it simply has to be filled by another law enforcement officer.

So we know that \$2 billion isn't truly \$2 billion. Maybe that cost has been passed off to somebody else,

maybe that cost is truly not a saving, but it never captured the \$2 billion. That's where they went into game plan two.

Now we've discovered, just a few short weeks ago, that the government has decided to go to game plan three. Game plan three is a cross between game plan two and game plan one. What they're doing in this game plan is that they're going to let the deficit run, but they're not going to brag about it. That's the difference.

You see, in game plan one, when they let the deficit run, they stood and said, "We're fighting the recession, not the deficit," beat their chests, pounded the drums. "Aren't we wonderful socialists?"

Game plan two was: "Okay, maybe we're not wonderful socialists. We've got to rein in the cost of government. We're going to try to get \$2 billion back. This is how we're going to do it."

Game plan three—and I'm sure cabinet had a long discussion about this and I'm certain there was some angst. I watch Fourth Reading, and apparently the Minister of Energy was a prime mover and shaker with respect to ensuring that the social service cuts would not happen, that the welfare cuts wouldn't happen, and that game plan three would be, "We'll let the deficit run up by another \$2 billion, but we won't brag about it."

By not bragging about it, they think they can still maintain this vote they've got with respect to fiscal responsibility, that 3%, and they would also maintain that left-wing, social conscience vote of 3%. Putting it together, they would come up with their 6%. That is now game plan three. As you can see, game plan one and two pretty much evaporated any support they had, so they're solidifying that 6% base they've worked themselves towards.

What is the lesson you learn when reviewing the last few budgets by a chameleon-like Treasurer? And I truly mean that: a chameleon-like Treasurer. You can't pin him down. One minute you think he's Frank Miller and the next minute you think he's Ed Broadbent. You can't seem to nail him down in terms of what he is, because every budget's different. One budget's a spending budget: "Deficit be damned, full speed ahead, damn the torpedoes." The next budget he's clawing \$2 billion back in social contracts. And you don't have to be a genius to know what this budget coming up is going to be. It's going to mean that the deficit will be up proportionately by some \$2 billion. The deficit's going to ring in at around \$10 billion, \$11 billion, \$12 billion. So much for the social contract.

You're also going to understand, because they've changed tracks again, that they may fool some of the people some of the time, but they're not going to fool the bond rating agencies—and that's all of the people all of the time. I'm willing to bet today with any member across the floor, knowing that you've got a \$2-billion shortfall, knowing you didn't make those cuts with transfer payments, knowing you didn't make those cuts in social service recipients, that you are going to have to then flog that back on to the deficit. By flogging that back on to the deficit, the bond rating agencies are going to see that you abandoned your restraint, "Hold it down

as best we can" approach, and they're going to downgrade you.

As sure as we're sitting here today, when my friend the Treasurer stands before this Legislature and announces his fourth budget, I believe, and announces the plan of leaving the deficit at \$10 billion or \$11 billion or \$12 billion, you are going to get downgraded. You may well be downgraded to the A category.

1650

**Mrs Haslam:** You've got to look after people.

**Mr Stockwell:** I hear from the member across the floor. That's fair comment. You have to look after people. What I've been driving at for the past 15 minutes or so is, pick a plan and stick with it, because you've got to run your game plan from middle to end to see if it works. If it was, "Damn the deficit, full speed ahead," so be it. If it was a restraint-conscious, "Hold it in, rein in the costs," so be it. But don't make it a hybrid of one and the other and think you're going to solve anything at all. That's the first point I wanted to make.

I also wanted to make it because one of the comments I recall vividly as the treasury critic for my party when he introduced the first budget was that I was getting far too exercised about this budget. In fact, paper bags were mentioned and, "Calm down," and so on. Yes, I was very animated in my opposition. In the end, the proof is in the pudding.

If there's one single event that this government has done that has shaped its demise and shaped its low ranking in public opinion polls, has shaped and formed this government, it was that very first budget. Why? By institutionalizing double-digit deficits, you lost the capacity to manage. By losing the capacity to manage, all you were left with was to figure out a process and a method to get that money back.

I will say this, and there is never any politician anywhere in this country, probably this world, that won't tell you this is true: It's so much easier to give it than it is to take it away. You can deal with that on stop signs or stop lights or community centres or \$10-billion deficits. Once you give them, it's very tough to get them back. That's the first point.

Let me talk about the bond-rating agencies. There is some thought across the floor that there seems to be some kind of right-wing, conservative game plan out there to embarrass this government. Nothing could be further from the truth with respect to the bond-rating agencies. The bond-rating agencies are true bean counters. They are truly bean counters from the word "Go." They don't care who's in power. They don't care what political stripe they are. They don't care what you believe personally with respect to social programs, deficits etc. All they care about is what you are doing with your finances and what you are planning to do in the future.

The bond-rating agencies are going to review your budget once again and they're going to come to the same conclusions they've come to in the past number of years. Your bond-rating agencies are going to say to you, "You are going to be downgraded." Why are they going to say that to you? They're going to say it for a series of



reasons, not the least of which will be: "You are playing with the books. You're fudging the numbers." Your smoke-and-mirrors budgeting comes home to roost every time you get downgraded.

I honestly don't understand why this government and its caucus, particularly its backbench members, can't seem to understand that. I don't understand why when you talk about selling your rolling stock to an offshore investor and then making a deal to lease it back over a long-term process and then taking that money and applying it into your operating budget of that year, you don't see that people who are in an investment community see that as trickery.

**Mr Sutherland:** No, they don't. They know what it's all about.

**Mr Stockwell:** They know what it's all about, and that's why you keep getting downgraded. That's why. I know the member for Oxford doesn't understand it. He's a bright fellow, a bright guy, and I understand why he doesn't understand it. He doesn't want to understand it. That's the problem.

When you have an asset on your books that you own outright of rolling stock of GO trains, there is no debt against it. You've purchased it up front with money, you sell that to an offshore investor and then take a long-term lease back. Any bond-rating agency, any accountant, is going to classify that as an encumbrance, a debt. You owe that money. The day before you didn't and today you do. They're going to calculate that into how much money you must pay out over the next number of years to stay afloat. That gets applied to your debts.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** You have to take into account the revenue.

**Mr Sutherland:** We know that, they know that.

**Mr Stockwell:** It's not a difficult argument. I hear from the Minister of Energy you have to take into account the revenue. You see, he doesn't understand. You took into account the revenue when you owned them outright. You take into account the same revenue once you've sold them. There's no difference. You're not changing the amount of money you're creating in revenue.

If you were, I would say, "Mr Minister, you're right." If you were going to get more revenue from selling them offshore and leasing them back, I'd say, "Mr Minister, you're right." But the bottom line is, the minister isn't right because whether you own them wholly or you lease them back from an offshore investor, you get the same amount of revenue. That's the point.

Now what else did they do that these bond-rating agencies concern themselves with? They concern themselves with a couple of other things. One of the things that they really concern themselves with is the same thing the auditor concerned himself with. What is that? I know the member from Durham knows. I know the member for Oxford knows, because I know he's a bright guy and I know he knows that when you defer \$3 billion worth of payments in a pension plan, these bond-rating agencies, accountants and so on see that as a cumulated debt. They see that as off-book debt.

**Mr Sutherland:** It's all taken into account.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member said it's all taken into account. May I say this, Madam Speaker? I will give the member my one hour and 10 minutes left to go and pick up a budget book that the Treasurer, the Minister of Finance, issued last year. I challenge that member for Oxford to pick up the budget book and show to me in that budget book exactly where he took that \$3 billion into account, because when it calls for the deficit figure for the coming year, the \$3 billion in pension money is not taken into account.

You know what else isn't taken into account, I say to my friend for Oxford, the learned member from Oxford, what else isn't taken into account? The money that you're shipping off to these crown corporations, these crown agencies. My friend, that's not taken into account, and I will cite the page: 96. If you go to page 96 of the budget and you go down to the deficit, you get a deficit figure. In very small writing underneath, they refer to those numbers and they're not taken into consideration when you look at the cumulated deficit.

I say to my friend from Oxford, if you want to prove me wrong, go get yourself a budget, turn to page 96 and you prove me wrong, because I'm not wrong and the member for Oxford knows I'm not wrong. He won't go and get the book, he won't look it up and he won't present it to me because it's not that I'm any genius; the bond-rating agencies figured it out as well, the accountants figured it out. The Treasurer—

**Mr Sutherland:** We tell them what we're doing.

**Mr Stockwell:** The auditor figured it out. The member across the floor caterwauls that we told them about it. If in fact you told them about it, why did you not show your deficit as an aggregate, a cumulate total of your deficits outstanding, including the crown agencies? Why did you not show that? Why they didn't show it was because they wanted to be able to say they kept the deficit under \$10 billion, as if that's some kind of magic figure.

Also, it might be somewhat embarrassing to see the deficit go up and ring in at what it truly should ring in at, considering the fact that they had their three-legged stool, and you know what I think about their three-legged stool. So there's the problem and there's the rub.

**Mr White:** Brilliant analysis. So what are you going to do?

**Mr Stockwell:** The member from Durham—you know what? I must have come a long way since I first came into this place because I would offer up these kinds of analyses and I'd be pooh-poohed, they'd be considered right-wing, dinosaur logic. At least today it's a brilliant analysis and he says, "Now what are you going to do?" What am I going to do?

**Mr White:** Go ahead.

**Mr Stockwell:** I want to be able to at least say this. One of these—

**Mr White:** Which hospitals are you going to close?

**Mr Stockwell:** I'd like to be able to say this. I would like to say that considering the predicament you're in today, I wouldn't be in that predicament. I know that's

easy to say, but considering the fact—

**Mr White:** So what would you do? Go for it, Chris, tell us what you'd do.

**Mr Stockwell:** I just ask for a moment's breath. Considering the fact that I stood in my place when you announced this budget and absolutely went ballistic, saying it was the wrong approach and the wrong thing to do—don't be giving out 6% settlements to the unions, don't be giving 14% increases to the senior civil servants, don't be doing this kind of stuff, and you did it anyway—I will say with some certainty that I wouldn't be in the situation you're in today because I never would have adopted that original budget.

1700

Having said that, it's not over. Clearly, we're still a province. Clearly, we still have problems. Clearly, we can still, hopefully, resolve the problem. But the difficulty is that now, by solving the problem, it's becoming more painful. Every day you avoid this problem it becomes more painful.

It's much like the person who's afraid to go to the doctor. They're afraid to go to the doctor and as long as they don't go, that thing festers and gets worse and then finally they end up going to the doctor and they've got to lop their arm off; whereas, before, they simply could have stitched up the wound.

That's the difficulty we're in with this government today. Now they want to go the doctor and they're just one big, huge, pussy boil and they're mad at me, being the doctor, for saying, "Now we've got to lop off your leg." That's the dilemma we're faced with.

That's the dilemma, because now what is it going to take? It's going to take some radical surgery to bring this budget, this institutionalized double-digit deficit, this cost overrun probably second to none, back into a reasonable amount, back into a reasonable budget and back into reasonable taxes. The member from Durham asked what I would do. Well, you know, it's going to take hours upon hours, years upon years to rectify this huge mistake.

As I've dealt with the budget and I've dealt with the bond-rating agencies, what I'd like to talk about is the staffing concerns with the corporations they've announced.

They seem never to be satisfied. They seem never to be satisfied with simply reporting out the facts of the finances. They always seem to be trying to trick the taxpayer, trick us and trick everyone who comes along. They do it, and they've tried in this last go-round about a year ago with these crown agencies.

The trick was to try and get some debt off books and get some staff off books so that when they go back to the electorate they can say: "Boy, did we ever keep a lid on this mess. The debt's down because we don't show it as an accrued amount." Now they're going to say, and this is really offensive, "We've also decreased the staffing complement within the province of Ontario."

The question then is going to be, "How did you go about decreasing the staffing complement in the province of Ontario?" One of the key factors in reviewing that figure will be the number of employees they've taken

from the ministry payroll and shipped off to these crown agencies. They won't show up as staff on the provincial payroll but we, as taxpayers, will still be paying them as crown agencies.

They think this is okay. They think this kind of bookkeeping is acceptable. They think it's okay—and this is what really aggravates me—because they get away with it. That is terrible. That's like saying it's okay to rob a bank as long as you don't get caught; it's okay to create some white-collar crime, or do that kind of stuff, as long as you don't get caught. So it's okay if we move these staff off to crown agencies, decrease our complement having not decreased the payroll and say, oh, yeah, they've decreased staff because they haven't been caught.

You know what, Madam Speaker? The sad truth of the situation is, they won't get caught. They won't get caught. You know why they won't get caught? Because the average taxpayer in this province won't take the time to review the books to understand why they didn't get caught. That's truly offensive to me, which brings me to another point.

Look, let's be frank. This is not the first government that plays a little smoke and mirrors with the budget. This is not the first government to fool around with the numbers; I admit that. We did our fair share, I admit it. The Liberals were crafty characters as well. I will admit that the Liberals were crafty characters. What I will say, though, is, reading the budgets of the last 10 or so years, I don't think anyone's been as crafty as these people.

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I wish to inform the members of the Legislature that the member for Burlington South wishes to withdraw his motion on standing order 34(a) for this evening and, further, that the Minister of Community and Social Services has been so advised.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House that this request for withdrawal, this action be—is it agreed?

**Mr Perruzza:** No.

**The Acting Speaker:** We have no unanimous consent.

**Mr Arnott:** The member may wish to give agreement to this suggestion, Madam Speaker. The minister has indicated he will not be here either.

**Mr Stockwell:** Go ahead, take your foot out of your mouth, Tony.

**The Acting Speaker:** I will ask once more if there is unanimous consent that there not be the question and answer at 6 o'clock with regard to the Community and Social Services ministry. Is it agreed? Agreed. Thank you very much.

Now we will return to the debate. The member, I believe, has the floor.

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I believe my friend from Etobicoke has a lot of good things to say. It would be nice if there was a quorum here to hear him.

**The Acting Speaker:** Could the Clerk please determine if a quorum is present.



**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex McFedries):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** Now we will be able to resume the debate, and the member for Etobicoke West has the floor.

**Mr Stockwell:** I was talking about the fact that they aren't going to get caught with respect to the—that brought me to this argument, and I was discussing the trickery. I've referred to a lot of the stuff they've done as jiggery-pokery, but what I have gathered from this kind of budgeting and financing is that there is a dramatic need, a huge desire, firstly on the part of the taxpayers; there is an incredible desire from me, and I think maybe from this side of the House, that if there's anything that any government could do, it would be to standardize the accounting practices of their government and any future governments.

I ask you that and I would like to put that forward because there's a human edge involved here. The human edge is that when it comes time to make a difficult decision, human nature dictates—and I think it's done so at the federal level with the old Conservative Party and has done so with the new Liberal Party. It has happened with this government. It probably happened with the previous Liberal government provincially, and maybe will with us. But when it comes time to make a difficult decision to inform the electorate or kind of make things up, governments seem to go about making things up.

As it snowballs, what ends up happening at the end of the day is the financial picture doesn't change. You're still in that very difficult position. The dollars you've spent still have to be accounted for. You end up with a big, huge amount of money owed at the end of the year, and the government then has to kind of come clean.

I would ask—

**Mr Paul R. Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings):** Members of the government to leave, right?

**Mr Stockwell:** No. I would ask any government that goes in next time, be it the government in power or the Liberals or the Conservatives, that one undertaking be given to the taxpayers in this province: that never again will a government be able to manipulate the figures, manipulate the finances and manipulate the books in this province; that all reporting functions will be standardized on accepted accounting principles; that never again can deficit figures be played with for political purposes and to in fact fool the taxpayers of this province. I don't say that specifically about this government; I think it's happening federally and provincially down the years. But it has become so bad that we have governments that are \$5 billion, \$6 billion and \$7 billion out on year-end financial statements.

1710

**Mr Perruzza:** Hey, Chris, strap yourself into that seat, will you. You're going to be there a long time.

**Mr Stockwell:** He got his shoe out of his mouth.

I say that if this could be adopted by an all-party committee, by all the representatives in this Legislature, it would be one of the truly important things that we could do, as a group, for the taxpayers in this province. This is non-partisan, this is not parochial, this is not partisan politics. What it is is a piece of legislation that will allow the taxpayers to understand finally and once and for all, no matter what government is in there, that proper accounting principles are practised and the numbers that come out during the budget and at the end of the year are factual. That would go a long way to buying a lot of credibility within the province with its taxpayers and its elected officials.

I don't suppose it's going to happen within the life of this government. I think it's something that you're going to have to campaign on. I would encourage all the leaders of every party to campaign on that, because I think the people in this province would be willing to buy in to that. I think they'd be excited about seeing finally, once and for all, uniform statistics and uniform numbers and uniform accounting practices that can be measured government to government, year to year, politician to politician.

Why would that be good? Because when you go out there as a socialist—and I, to some degree, have a harder time with the left-wingers than the right-wingers, probably being from the right side. But the left-wingers go out there and say, "We can have programs X, Y and Z," and they don't pay for them, but they provide them. To some degree, the Conservatives have done it as well in the past. What happens is that you end up providing programs X, Y and Z and you haven't paid for them. By not paying for it, it becomes a painless program. People then become accustomed to this program because they haven't paid for it. So in the end it's like giving something away free. You can give anything away free. Garage sales are the perfect example of that. It's garbage in a lot of instances, but if you say it's free, people take it away.

So now you've got programs that are maybe worthy, not so worthy and terrible, and they're all out there for people to access and use, and use whether they're effective or not, and fundamentally they're all free.

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** Free.

**Mr Stockwell:** Free; because we don't pay for them. You know what it comes down to? Welfare. Welfare is fundamentally free, no cost to the taxpayer. Why is that? Because the cost of welfare in this province is around \$7 billion; your deficit is significantly more than \$7 billion.

**Mr Perruzza:** Is this a new Conservative dogma? "Everything is free."

**Mr Stockwell:** Fundamentally, we're not taxing for it, nobody is paying for it, so it's in fact free. So as long as you leave this impression in people's minds that these programs don't cost anything, they always want them. If you tell them, "Okay, here are the programs; let's pay for them," rather than being free, then I think people would have a different attitude. I think people would have a different point of view. I think people may say, "Well, that program may be good, but frankly I'm not prepared to pay for it."

**Mr Perruzza:** Hey, Chris, do you notice nobody sits behind you when you speak?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Etobicoke West has the floor.

**Mr Stockwell:** No, I had not noticed that, Tony. Now you've mentioned it, I'm going to look into that.

**The Acting Speaker:** Please proceed, the member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Stockwell:** I have no idea why the member for Downsview is not in cabinet, I honestly don't. He would be a worthy addition. He must know the printing industry, because apparently he got a lot of letterhead printed before he got here. He's got expert advice in carpentry. He knows how to remove feet from mouths. He'd be a perfect guy to have in cabinet.

**Mr Perruzza:** Are you advocating for me, Chris?

**Mr Bradley:** Is there not a pothole to be fixed?

**Mr Stockwell:** Sure, there must be a pothole, a stop sign to be held up, a poop and scoop to be scooped. The member for Downsview surely should be able to do those things.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Etobicoke West, please proceed.

**Mr Stockwell:** I don't want to insult them, but I wish they'd separate, because it's difficult to tell them apart when they're so close together.

**Mr Perruzza:** I also have a high school diploma to show you, Chris. Do you want to see it?

**Mr Stockwell:** Yes, I do.

**Mr Perruzza:** Well, I've got one.

**Mr Stockwell:** Congratulations. We will announce that the member for Downsview has a high school diploma.

**The Acting Speaker:** Would you please direct your remarks to the Chair.

**Mr Stockwell:** I think there should be an investigation into that high school.

I now want to move on to that free program, and that's what it really comes down to: free. When we talk about free, we talk about no cost. The problem is that the taxpayers don't think there's a cost, but there is a huge cost at the end of the day to us, and the cost is always increased, because by not paying it off, you've got the interest payments on top.

It would be very helpful, at least to us in the Conservative caucus, if we could standardize accounting practices and at least admit that when we spend money, if we're not going to pay for it, we'll tell the people at the end of the day how much money we spent that we didn't collect. That would at least be one small, small step, for me personally, in enlightening the taxpayers in the province of Ontario.

**Mr Perruzza:** What else is free, Chris?

**Mr Stockwell:** What else is free? It could apply to anything. Every taxpayer can apply it to whatever they want. If it's welfare, welfare's free. If it's health care, health care's free. If it's education, education's free. You can take the \$8 billion or \$10 billion or \$12 billion or

\$13 billion you don't collect and apply it to any program you want.

Now, if you said to those same taxpayers, "Pay for all that stuff," I think you'd have a revolt. People would say, "Forget it." What is the PIT now, 56% or 57%? You'd have to bump it up to the 75% to 80% range, probably more, and then people would say, "This is crazy, that 80 cents of every buck I earn will go to the provincial government to pay for the programs we've instituted that we haven't paid for in the past?" You'd have a very vigorous and healthy debate on the merits of government spending inside of one week. The reason we don't, the reason it doesn't create a vigorous and healthy debate, is because we don't pay for them. People think they're free, and that's the problem.

I'll tell you something else, about OHIP and the employer health tax. I was a firm believer and a staunch supporter of the premiums you paid when you had the OHIP card. I believed in that, and I understand why you don't believe in it. But I didn't believe in it only because it raised money. You know why I also believed in it? It became a check in the check and balance system. Maybe your company paid your OHIP premiums or maybe you paid them personally, but when that payment was made—and it was always a small payment, \$30, \$34 a month for a family, I believe, always a fairly small payment—that was a check in the system that allowed the province to say, "Okay, who's that cheque from?" and it ticked off who was covered.

**Mr Arnott:** Why did they change it?

**Mr Stockwell:** The Liberals changed it. You'll have to get some kind of analogy why the Liberals changed it. But when they changed it, what happened was that you lost that check, because then companies were simply sending it in based on payroll. It wasn't based on people, wasn't based on the people who worked there and on who was covered and that when they got all these cheques in they could put into the system that Joe Blow paid, that Tom, Frank—

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** No.

**Mr Stockwell:** Don't say no. I know, because I paid my premiums, and when I paid the premiums, I was told I owed \$32 to get my OHIP or my health care.

The reason the system has fallen apart is not because it was ideological; it's because the system broke. The balance was removed and a payroll tax was levied without specific remuneration or specific accounts applied.

**Mr Arnott:** And it was the Liberals who did it.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, it was the Liberals who did it. For all the good intentions you had, Madam Minister, I'll say this: You could have had 30 million health cards out there when the Conservatives were running the OHIP system, but it didn't matter, because the only active cards were the ones where the premiums were paid. If you didn't pay your premium and you went to see the doctor, bells and whistles went off. You know what else? If you tried to rip off our system with a card that wasn't being paid for, the bells and whistles went off and you got caught.



1720

Now this government produces cards—and I'm not blaming it specifically; it was brought in by the Liberals—for dogs, for dead people, for cats. They just send them out. Then, when the lawbreakers get hold of these things and use them at the doctor's office, there are no bells and whistles going off because there's no premium applied.

**Mr White:** What about Visa and MasterCard?

**Mr Stockwell:** What about Visa? Visa is the same thing. The thing about Visa is, they stop letting you use your Visa when you don't pay for it. I think even the member from Durham knows that.

**Mr Fletcher:** You can run up \$3,000.

**Mr Stockwell:** That may be true, but at least they stop you. In the health system you can run up a bill for \$200,000 and still use it. That's the difficulty.

That seems to be a very simple approach, but what stopped that approach was an overanxious government, to buy public support, thought that \$30 a month that a family was paying for OHIP would buy it some support. In the end, it didn't buy them any support; they still lost.

**Mr Fletcher:** No, Chris, you are wrong.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member says I'm wrong. I'll listen briefly to why I'm wrong.

**Mr Fletcher:** It didn't go on your name.

**The Acting Speaker:** No. The member for Etobicoke West has the floor. Other members can contribute later.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member says that it didn't go by your name. As far as I know, and I stand to be corrected, when the company agreed to meet the OHIP premium payment, it did so—

**Mr Fletcher:** They sent in an amount depending on whether it was a family, single or whatever.

**Mr Stockwell:** Right. He said it was based on family, single or whatever. What it came down to is that if you were an employee and you had a family, you qualified for the family OHIP premium and your company would remit based on the family OHIP premium. I don't know what the member is talking about. I'll ask him to clarify after. As far as I know, that's how it worked.

I got off track there, but that seems to be a perfect example of one change that took place that simply erupted the health care system in this province, all for the sake of \$30 a month per family and less for a single, all for the sake of removing that cost from them, in a lot of instances already borne by the company they worked for.

You see, that was the mistake, because the check that was put in place by a previous administration was removed but the program stayed and therefore you didn't have any checks, you didn't have any balances and it became ripe for being ripped off. I'll tell you something. Any time you've got a program that's an easy mark to be ripped off, there are people out there who will rip it off.

Unemployment: I want to review quickly, on the unemployment end, Jobs Ontario. I heard a lot of discussion today with respect to Jobs Ontario in the Liberal Party and Jobs Ontario with respect to the New Democrats. Let me just say that Jobs Ontario, when it was

announced, was a \$2-billion program initiated by the socialist government in the province of Ontario.

**Mr Perruzza:** Oh, those nasty folks.

**Mr Stockwell:** No, not nasty folks; somewhat incompetent at times, but definitely not nasty. That \$2 billion was supposed to produce 100,000 jobs. That's not my number. That's not the number that was cooked up by our caucus or cooked up by the official opposition. That was the number you held out—

**Mr White:** What number does your caucus cook up?

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm trying to get to the point, but let me just clarify this. That was the number your government held out: 100,000 jobs for a \$2-billion investment.

**Mr Perruzza:** You know the numbers you guys cooked up. Remember Helle Hulgaard? You advised her to quit her job and go on welfare. Those are the numbers you guys cooked up. Go ask her now if she is better off.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Downsview, come to order.

**Mr Stockwell:** We are now a long way down the road from when this was originally implemented and originally planned. We're so far down the road that in fact there should be at least at 100,000 jobs. The minister said today that the money has been spent and has created exactly 30,000 jobs. In fact, there's some dispute about the last 10,000 jobs, about whether they're filled or waiting to be filled. I will give them the benefit of the doubt. They created, say, 30,000 jobs for a \$2-billion investment.

It seems to me that if we use their analogies, their totals, their statistics, this can only be classified as a dismal failure. I'm not saying that because I don't agree with the program—I don't; I think it doesn't work for a whole bunch of reasons—but this is the government that said it would produce 100,000 jobs for \$2 billion, and with the \$2 billion they produced 30,000 jobs.

**Mr White:** How many jobs did the federal government cost in this province? How many jobs were lost because of free trade? Was your federal government successful because it killed a quarter of a million jobs, Chris?

**Mr Stockwell:** They sit here caterwauling at me, and I'm not sure why. I didn't pick this number; you did. I didn't tell them it would produce 100,000 jobs; you picked it.

**Mr Perruzza:** You're exaggerating the numbers on both sides, and you know it.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, the member says I'm exaggerating the numbers. I would ask the member for Downsview, Anthony Perruzza—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. Would the member take his seat. The member for Etobicoke West has this time in order to express his opinions. He will do that, and you have a chance to respond after. The member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Perruzza:** But don't let him speak out of both sides of his mouth, Madam Speaker.

**Mr Stockwell:** To be fair, if these are exaggerated

numbers, I ask the member for Downsview, go get the right numbers. You go now and get the numbers, or go get the announcement that was made by your government and get the numbers. The numbers were clear.

**Mr Perruzza:** Don't you know them?

**Mr Stockwell:** That's the number, 100,000 jobs. If you dispute that number, go get the statement in the House made by your minister and correct me. He won't go and get it, because that was the number, and the dollar value was \$2 billion. If you dispute me, then go out, get the documentation and I will be more than happy to say I was wrong by showing it to me. But you're not going to get out of your seat. You're too busy caterwauling because you're wrong.

The sooner you admit that you're wrong when it comes to the Jobs Ontario figures the better off this province will be, because they'll admit that this was a fiasco. Not everything they've done is a fiasco, I admit that, but Jobs Ontario—

**Mr Perruzza:** Why don't you sit down right now and I will stand up and dispute those numbers. Sit down and give me the floor.

**Mr Stockwell:** Go get the numbers.

**Mr Perruzza:** Sit down and give me the floor and I'll do that.

**Mr Arnott:** Madam Chair, will you call him to order.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Stockwell:** See what I mean? Sit down and give him the floor. I can't give him the floor, because the process is the way it is. I asked the member to go out and get the numbers. He still sits there. I asked the member to show to the people of this province that in fact they didn't say 100,000 jobs. I asked that he prove that they didn't say \$2 billion. I asked that he go out and get the number of jobs they've created: 30,000 jobs.

**Mr Perruzza:** You sit down and give me the floor.

**Mr Stockwell:** Madam Speaker, I think that either you get this guy under control or you ask him to go get the numbers. Short of that, he's just blathering away over there with no documentation, no evidence, no proof.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the member for Etobicoke West to continue with your remarks through the Chair.

**Mr Stockwell:** Will do. I would ask the Minister of Energy. Maybe he's got access to certain documents from cabinet that he can give the member for Downsview that show Jobs Ontario was supposed to produce 100,000 jobs. Jobs Ontario has produced 30,000 jobs. It was supposed to be 100,000 right now, and we spent \$2 billion producing those 30,000 jobs.

If that is challenged, I accept the challenge. If any one of those statistics or numbers can be proven wrong, I accept it; prove it wrong.

But you know what, they won't, because they're factual. It's numbers that they said they could do. It's 100,000 jobs that they said they'd create. It's \$2 billion that they said they'd spend. So if they accept the fact that you had 100,000 jobs, you created 30,000 and you spent \$2 billion, even the staunchest supporter of your party is

going to say that is a dismal failure.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Are you going to go on to something else or are you going to repeat yourself?

**Mr Stockwell:** I say to the member for Yorkview, as long as I get challenged that these are in fact not true, I will be upset and I will continue on, because I want this government member, rather than caterwauling, to go out and prove me wrong. The member for Downsview does a lot of yelling. He doesn't do much reading, he doesn't do much investigation, he just simply caterwauls.

**The Acting Speaker:** To the member, I think we have—

**Mr Stockwell:** If it's wrong, I say to the member for Downsview, then go out and check it. Prove me wrong.

**The Acting Speaker:** To the member—

**Mr Stockwell:** Because you don't do any reading, because you don't do any examination, don't blame me, don't blame this caucus—

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. To the member for Etobicoke West, you have made your point to the members across the way. I would ask you if you would continue with your further remarks. We have made that point already.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, I have, but clearly it hasn't worked.

**Mr Perruzza:** Some of us read beyond the Toronto Sun headlines, Chris.

**Mr Stockwell:** I would ask the member to go read. I would ask the member to investigate, because he sits there heckling and saying these are incorrect figures. I would ask him, I beg him, I'm saying to you, if they're wrong, prove it. But you don't read, you don't investigate, you don't do your research; don't blame me.

1730

Madam Speaker, I'll move on to another topic. It may well upset the members from Yorkview and Downsview across the floor.

**Mr Perruzza:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: My point is simply this, that if the member checks the facts he will well know that all of our Jobs Ontario initiatives have created or maintained close to 300,000 jobs. He would know that. In fact, that has even made the Toronto Sun headline. He should read the Toronto Sun.

**The Acting Speaker:** Would the member take his seat. That is some information that I know you are passing to the member across the way, but it is not a point of order.

**Mr Stockwell:** Madam Speaker, "created or maintained," that's not what they said when they announced the program. They said they would create 100,000 jobs. The minister today said they've created 30,000 jobs, and it's a clear challenge. If he decides not to take up the challenge, I understand it, but standing up on a point of order, playing with words about "created or maintained" is not going to cut it.

I say to you and I say to the government that by creating 30,000 when you said you'd create 100,000 and then spending the \$2 billion is a catastrophic failure, and having this member across the floor start rewording it is



not a service to the people, it's not a service to this Legislature. It's only a service to his small mind if he believes that he thinks by saying "creating or maintaining" 300,000 jobs he's serving anybody.

The program called for 100,000 new jobs. They've created 30,000 new jobs and they spent the \$2 billion. I still ask the member opposite to go out, get the figures, get the numbers and prove them wrong, because he can't.

I have one real concern with respect to the federal Liberal government, and I think the government opposite has spent a significant amount of time blaming federal governments for the mess that it's in. In some instances they are legitimate complaints. In some instances they have not received some cooperation from federal governments that they've in fact served with during their past three and a half years.

But it seems to me that almost every time you try and ask this government a question on an issue there's somebody to blame. Whether it's the federal Liberal Party or the federal Conservative Party or the opposition or whatever, the business community or the bond-rating agencies, there's always someone to blame.

I want to make this point specifically. This government seems intent on complaining about a federal government that has frozen its transfer payments over the past number of years. They're also intent on suggesting that they, as a particular cog within this country we call Canada, do not receive their fair share of moneys from the federal government. They're very intent on explaining to the people of this province that they think they're being ripped off for some billions of dollars because of their geographical location, because of their history and because of their success in previous years.

I will say to that, that's the way this country works. I will also say to that, that's the way this country has always worked. I say to this government, every time it complains about the short shrift it gets from the federal governments, it does exactly the same thing with municipal governments. You treat them exactly the same way.

This is what I don't understand. They seem to think that they're being hard put upon and hard pressed and singled out when it comes to transfer payments, but I look across the floor and I say to them, how much money does this government give to the education and school boards in Metropolitan Toronto?

I see the member from Durham who's heckling. How much money do you give to the Metropolitan Toronto school boards?

**Mr White:** How much money did you give?

**Mr Stockwell:** The member doesn't even know the answer. The member doesn't even know the answer to the question.

**Mr White:** Not one penny less than you gave.

**Mr Stockwell:** That's exactly right. The same analogy can be applied. He's missed the analogy. The analogy is, how come it's okay for this government to treat Metropolitan Toronto differently than it treats the rest of the province? How come it's okay for them to give no money to Metropolitan Toronto for education yet give 70% and 80% to other sections within this province?

How come that is okay? Why is that okay for them to do it to the Metropolitan Toronto school boards but it isn't okay for the federal government to use the same philosophy when allotting funds to the provinces? More money goes to the weaker provinces and less money goes to the stronger provinces. That's always been the way this country's worked. That's always been the way this province has worked.

I can also make another example: health boards. In Metropolitan Toronto their health boards get significantly less money than other regions in this province. How can you complain about a federal government treating you exactly the same way that you treat regions within your own province? It's hypocritical. On the one hand you cry because you don't get the same as the other provinces, and on the other hand you dole out money differently, depending on what region of the province you live in.

I've never understood that. I've never understood how a government complains when it's getting the money, and does exactly the same thing when it's giving the money and calls it fair and equitable. If that isn't a double standard, what is a double standard? If that isn't a double standard, to complain about the way the federal government allots its money based on regional areas, and then do exactly the same thing to the municipalities—it's exactly the same thing.

I don't want to hear the complaining about the federal government and transfer payments, because we at Metropolitan Toronto have said to you for years, "You don't give us any money; that's not fair," and they still say it today and you tell them—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** What do they tell them? "Because you're wealthy, because you have a huge pool of money, because you've got a lot of assessment, we aren't going to give you the same amount of money that Wawa gets for education because of those reasons."

What is the federal government saying? "Because you're wealthier, because you're more successful, because you have more revenue, you're not going to get the same amount of money that Newfoundland gets when it comes to transfer payments." The same principles apply to us at the municipal level that the federal government applies to them provincially, yet they caterwaul and complain every single time their moneys are frozen.

I'll tell you something else. The same transfer payment municipalities are the same people who have had their transfer payments not just frozen but in fact reduced over the past number of years; the same people. So as they complain about being frozen at the federal level, they've in fact reduced transfer payments to municipalities, hospitals and school boards around this province.

It seems to ring rather hollow.

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** How would you increase them?

**Mr Stockwell:** "How would you increase them?" Why is that not the question you asked the federal government? When the federal government freezes your transfer payments, why don't you say, "Well, how could they possibly increase them?" See, it's a complete and

utter double standard; it's absolute hypocrisy.

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** No, they could move it around from another province.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member for Huron says they can move it around. I say to him, when you dole out your transfer money and your education money, why don't you move that education money around then? Why don't you give Metropolitan Toronto a dime one year, at least, rather than nothing? There's no answer, because it's a double standard; it's indefensible.

**Mr Klopp:** It should all go to rural Ontario.

**Mr Stockwell:** There's a member saying it should all go to rural Ontario, and the eastern provinces and the western provinces say that all the federal money should go to their areas. So this is a double-edged sword. The problem with this double-edged sword is that it cuts both ways. When they want to bellyache about the transfer payments at the federal level, let them clean up their own house; let them get their own house in order.

I know the members for Yorkview and Downsview know this very well. Let them get their own house in order. When they transfer money to their municipalities, which is no money to education, which is significantly less in health-related costs to the municipalities—

**Mr Mammoliti:** Why is that?

**Mr Stockwell:** Why is that? Well, I don't know. You should take that up with your cabinet because you can't seem to complain—you see, the difference is that when this party was in government, we got less money from the federal government; constantly we got less money from the federal government.

**Ms Sharon Murdock (Sudbury):** Oh, please.

**Mr Stockwell:** We did. We were a "have" province. Far more money was transferred out of this province and spread around this country than was taken in, in the way of transfer payments from the federal government. We didn't complain.

1740

**Hon Mr Hampton:** Are you the apologist for Brian Mulroney?

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, I think probably we were far better, more prudent fiscal managers than this government; probably we didn't have \$10-billion deficits; probably we didn't have welfare costs skyrocketing and unemployment rates in the double digits.

Yes, that's got a lot to do with it, but the fact is, that's got a lot to do with it because of the management of this province.

Furthermore, when we got less than the other provinces, we were proud to be in this country and we accepted the fact that the wealthier areas of this country, the wealthier regions, were going to have to go about supporting those not-so-wealthy regions. We in Metropolitan Toronto understand that we are a wealthy region in this province and some of the money that we pay is going to have to go to support other, not-so-wealthy, regions of this province.

I say to the Minister of Natural Resources, who's talking over there, I understand that a lot of money

comes out of Metro to go service his region. I understand that. I accept that.

I say to the Minister of Environment and Energy, I say to those people across the floor, when you go about—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Will the members come to order so I can hear the member who is speaking.

**Mr Stockwell:** When you go about—

**Hon Mr Hampton:** Take a geography lesson.

**Mr Stockwell:** Why?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The wealth of this city is built on the resources of northern Ontario.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Would members come to order. We would like to be able to hear the member who is speaking and has the floor. Will you continue, please.

**Mr Stockwell:** I understand when you have wealthier regions within an area, that money flows out and goes to other regions. I accept that fact. Municipalities such as Metropolitan Toronto that are extremely wealthy, with large dollars in assessment, I say to the Minister of Environment and Energy, understand that when it comes to spending money on education, they're not going to get any money.

I say to the Minister of Environment and Energy, if that is the policy of your government, then don't complain when the federal government adopts the same policy. That's all I'm saying. Why I say that is because on the one hand they complain about the federal government's transfer payment policy and on the other hand you have exactly the same policy within the municipalities.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** We froze them.

**Mr Stockwell:** You reduced them by 2% and you know it.

**Hon Mr Hampton:** Don't complain about equalization; learn the difference between equalization and transfers.

**Ms Murdock:** A cap on CAP is not the same thing.

**Mr Arnott:** A cap on CAP is a 5% increase.

**Mr Stockwell:** Exactly. A cap on CAP is a 5% hike you got from the federal government. Yes, it is. Learn the difference. I've got to take a lecture from somebody who doesn't understand that a cap on CAP is a 5% increase. My God. Why am I listening? I don't know sometimes.

Crown corporations: What I would do? I wouldn't do anything. I understand that Metropolitan Toronto is not going to get the same kind of grants or transfer payments as other regions. I accept that. I've always accepted it. When elected, I accepted it. I knew that some of the other regions were not so financially well off and they counted on the provincial government to maintain budgets and levels of service. What I am saying is, if I were sitting in the provincial government, I would also not complain about the federal government, which is exactly the same problem. That's what I'd do.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Excuse me. I hear the Minister of Natural Resources say, "Take a course on public



finance." Okay. I'll take a course on public finance.

The teachers' pension fund and OMERS, the next problem I want to deal with with respect to this government: We understand exactly what took place with respect to this government and the teachers' pension fund and the deferral of \$3 billion. I think that was a rather disgraceful process they went through. It's smoke and mirrors, jiggery-pokery, when it comes down to the finances of this province.

The bond rating agencies' biggest concern is the teachers' pension fund and how you passed off a \$3-billion transfer to those teachers' pensions.

What I'd like to say to you, Madam Minister, is they're now in the middle of negotiating the very same thing with the pension for the OPSEU pension plan. They're doing that, and in the way of negotiations, they're going to defer dollars that they are supposed to commit to the pension plan and not pay them. So what is it that they will end up doing? They will defer these dollars, and in future years when another government moves in and takes over, it will be left with the responsibility of coming up with the money that this government didn't put into those pension plans. They'll have to do that as well as handle a deficit in the double figures, as well as handle a tax system that's the highest in North America.

Of all the things they're doing, including licences—let me give you an example of the licence trick they're using. It's just awful. Here they have a licence process that was put in place, where you get your licence renewed on a yearly basis, extended to a three-year basis. Now they've extended that process to five years. What does that mean to the average taxpayer? What it means is they generate all kinds of revenue in the year they sell it, because you pay for your licence on a yearly basis. So the standard licensing fee gets multiplied by five. They generate all that income because they multiplied it by five and used it in-year. When the next government goes in, even though it's not a huge amount of money, they're not going to be able to get that money that is rightfully theirs to spend or not to spend or to retire debt, because they've captured that money by extending licences an extra two years. That's unbelievable. That is just awful, that they figure this is the way to go about raising revenue to offset a deficit: by stealing future governments' money. I can't believe that.

There's another method, and I'll tell you this other method about raising revenue is going to cause them some concern in the public at large: this photo-radar business.

**Mr Klopp:** You don't like safety.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member for Huron says, "You don't like safety." If I felt for a moment that photo-radar was a safety-driven initiative, I would support it. Photo-radar is a cash grab. It's a cash grab because it doesn't penalize the motorist; it arrests a licence plate. That's what photo-radar does. It doesn't penalize the person driving, it doesn't mean demerit points: It fines a licence plate. That's it.

I heard from across the floor one day when we were

talking about photo-radar: "We use these kinds of things everywhere. What about smoke and gift shops? What about local corner stores that have video cameras set up?" That's right. They use photo there to catch criminals. But they don't arrest the gun, for heaven's sake. They arrest the guy holding the gun.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: Just for the benefit of the French-language translation service, the correct translation of "photo-radar" is "cash register" in English.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. That's very interesting. Would the member please continue.

**Mr Stockwell:** That's a good one. This is the point: The analogy they tried to use in the beginning was that they have these kinds of things set up in smoke shops because they want to catch criminals. I agree with that, but you don't catch the gun; you catch the criminal. When you get the speeder, you don't arrest or catch the licence plate; you catch the speeder.

You want to know what's worse about it? If you think this is a safety measure, you will buy bridges off these people. There's nobody out there who believes this is a safety measure. They see right through this: It's a revenue grab. They know that when this car goes by, they snap a picture of the licence plate. They have no idea who's driving. The person, who wasn't driving, who happens to own the car can't even go into court and say: "I wasn't even driving the car. I have the person who was driving it right beside me and they will testify to that fact." You can't even do that. All they want is their money. They don't care who was driving it. There are no demerit points. They just want their money.

**Mr Mills:** Tell me what the OPP is saying. You don't know what they're saying.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Durham East, come to order.

**Mr Stockwell:** They had a ministry official comment on the front page of their ministry newspaper that they've been directed to go and find cash revenue sources, and he himself admitted this was one of the ideas. They parcelled it up as a measure to prevent accidents, to prevent death and said it will do that and that they will have photo-radar implemented, that it's not for the money, it's for the safety.

You know something, folks? The people in this province, when this gets instituted across the province, are going to be really ticked off.

1750

**Mr Klopp:** Photo-radar is cutting accidents, the police say. It's right there.

**Mr Stockwell:** "Calgary Photo-radar is Cutting Accidents," I see here.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Would the member wish to continue today?

**Mr Stockwell:** I wouldn't mind having the opportunity.

**Mr Murdoch:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: Maybe the member would like to continue. It would be

nice if the government of the day would come in and listen. I don't think we have a quorum.

**The Acting Speaker:** Do we have a quorum?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** Quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Etobicoke West may resume.

**Mr Stockwell:** I have some interesting comments from a member of the public that I'd like to put on the record. "The whole purpose is to collect money, because police aren't interested in who was actually driving the vehicle," says Charles Pester...a company that helps drivers fight traffic tickets in court. 'If I lend my car and somebody else is driving it and speeds, I still get stuck with the bill. How does that deter me from speeding? Photo-radar operators catch a guy going 40 kilometres (25 miles) over the limit and all they do is take a picture, even though the person is still speeding and could kill somebody down the road.'

"Ontario critics have also accused photo-radar of being nothing but a provincial cash grab."

Let me read this into the record too. The Minister of Transportation denied he knew what the figures were for photo-radar. Apparently Floyd Laughren knows what they are. "The budget indicated \$200 million a year would be generated under province-wide use of photo-radar," and that will be up to some \$1 billion on a year-to-year basis.

That was really interesting, and I'm glad the member brought this to my attention. What they're saying in Calgary is that photo-radar is a cash grab; what they're saying in Toronto is that photo-radar is a cash grab. What your Treasurer said is completely contrary to what your Minister of Transportation said. He said he didn't have any idea how much money would be generated by photo-radar, but the Treasurer says \$200 million.

If they're going to tell different stories, they've got to get them straight, if they're going to make them up as they go along. I was very happy that he brought this forward; it's a really interesting thing the member for Huron brings forward. I would ask that he go to the Minister of Transportation and say: "My gosh, Floyd is much more up on it than you are, because he knows the kind of revenue you're going to generate. You're the Minister of Transportation and you don't even know."

**Mr Mammoliti:** Stop wandering, Chris. You're better when you don't wander.

**The Acting Speaker:** Would the member for Yorkview come to order.

**Mr Stockwell:** Is he done? He should get some time from his caucus; he really should. It would be good of that caucus to allow the member for Yorkview some time. Considering the private member's bill brought forward by Mr Runciman from Leeds-Grenville talking about kicking people out their apartment when they're known drug dealers, that the member for Yorkview supported that, he deserved time to speak on that piece of

legislation. I think he spoke and said he was in favour of that piece of legislation.

It was just shameful, terrible that when the time came for a vote—he was sitting here not more than five minutes before the vote was taken, and then mysteriously he got locked out. Isn't that a shame? That's the kind of thing this government does. They obviously saw him, they obviously knew he was going to support the motion of the member for Leeds-Grenville, and they locked him out before the time had run out on the clock. That isn't real, fair politics, when they will go about muzzling the member for Yorkview by locking him out of the Legislature when he's going to vote for an opposition bill.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm sorry. I think I wandered there for a moment. I apologize.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. Would the member like to continue.

**Mr Stockwell:** I would also like to talk further about the permits, fishing licences. The camping one really ticks me up. They look for revenue generators, and the fishing licences I find offensive, to pay to go fishing in your lake where your cottage is; your permits. But campgrounds have gone up two and three times. Now, who uses campgrounds? The people who use campgrounds generally, senior citizens and those people that can afford probably a less than expensive holiday for their family during the year.

**Mr Bradley:** When was the last time you went camping?

**Mr Stockwell:** I was in a campground twice last year, and I'm glad the question was asked. I enjoy camping and I go to the provincial campsites and I take advantage of them because they're efficient, clean and well run.

But let me say this. The people who are using those campgrounds are people who have less money than those of us who sit around this Legislature. They're just plain, average folks. They're trying to get a two-week vacation or a one-week vacation away with their family. You know something? That increase in the permit fees for the campgrounds hit them and it hit them hard. When you talk two, three and four times increase year over year on a campsite, the campsite now is well over \$100, well over \$100 some campsites.

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** Per month?

**Mr Stockwell:** No, that's weekends, well over \$100 on weekends.

**Mr Cooper:** No.

**Mr Stockwell:** Oh, yes, very much so. It used to be you could get a campsite for the weekend for \$20, \$25, \$30. Today, in some instances, the better sites are over \$100 for the weekend and significantly more for the week. You know, these are people who just want to get their kids out of the city for a week and that's what these families call holidays.

I know it's not the killer, it's not the big money revenue grab and it's not going to make or break the province. But you know what? It's typical, it's symptomatic of this government's approach. You're so con-



cerned to raise revenue that you go—

**Mr Cooper:** What are the private sector operators asking?

**Mr Stockwell:** The member says what do the private campground operators rent their—but you know something? It's a different crowd that uses those private campgrounds. There's no doubt about it, it's a different crowd. It's those people who can afford—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** If they don't want to know the answer—it's those people who can afford to pay the fees for the private campground operators. The reason you had such booming success and the reason I supported these campgrounds was because they were inexpensive. It was a chance for people to get their kids out of the city.

Forget your government programs, forget all these programs about getting kids off the street. This was one program that worked because you didn't have to get involved, because it got kids out of the city for one and two weeks on end and you don't have to hire a single person to get them there; you've just got to charge a reasonable fee for the campgrounds.

**Mr Bradley:** No facilitators?

**Mr Stockwell:** No facilitators, no animators, no Dippers anywhere involved in this process at all. But now when you increase that by two and three and four times, you cut a whole bunch of people out of this program, and you know, it's not a lot of money, it's just another revenue grab.

When they go up there to go camping, they might want to go fishing and, instead of just taking their kids out fishing, they got to buy a permit to go fishing. They got to buy a permit for them and, if they have two or three kids, they got to buy a permit for every one of those kids. This to me is typical of this government.

**Interjection:** No permits for kids.

**Mr Stockwell:** No permits for the kids is the suggestion. They must be a certain age. The ones I've been—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Stockwell:** The ones I've been fishing with, they had to buy a permit. I assume they're kids.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Madam Speaker, all I can say to you is, it's another—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Durham Centre, please come to order.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, I do. You see, that's what the member from Durham says, I don't think camping's an issue. No, in its own little sleeve of what we do in this place, it's not an issue. But you know something? A lot of people think it is an issue, those people that go camping.

People who are going to get nailed by photo-radar—you know something, folks? They're going to think that's an issue. They're going to think it's an issue when they can get charged, convicted and billed without ever even thinking they got stopped. You can't plead your case. There are going to be a lot of people out there when that gets adopted.

There have been a lot of people who are ticked off because the taxes have gone up. There are a lot of people who are concerned about the deficit going up. All this gets folded in. There are a lot of people who are really ticked off with the fact you can spend \$2 billion on Jobs Ontario, say you're going to create 100,000 jobs and only create 30,000. A lot of people think that's a big issue.

A lot of people think that the auditor's statement when he said he wouldn't give you an unrestricted endorsement of your books—a lot of people think that's an issue.

Individually, maybe they're not issues that are earth-shattering. Collectively, I can't understand how you don't know that these are issues. You couldn't get any lower in the polls. People are saying, collectively—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, maybe you can, that's true. You can't get any lower. They got 6% in the last by-election. Yes, you can get less than 6%. You can. You can't get much lower in the by-elections, but it may well in fact happen.

Oh, I see I've got 6 of the clock ringing around. I will move adjournment of the House and look forward to the happy faces across the floor when I take up the challenge to educate this crew again.

**The Acting Speaker:** It is now 6 o'clock. This House stands adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 1800.











# CONTENTS

Tuesday 29 March 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Alternative fuels</b>                    |      |
| Mr Cleary                                   | 5225 |
| <b>Men and Wellness Conference</b>          |      |
| Mr McLean                                   | 5225 |
| <b>Acts of Kindness</b>                     |      |
| Mr Winninger                                | 5225 |
| <b>Fort Henry sunset ceremonial</b>         |      |
| Mr Cousens                                  | 5226 |
| <b>Neighbourhood Watch</b>                  |      |
| Mr Cooper                                   | 5226 |
| <b>Fire safety</b>                          |      |
| Mr Offer                                    | 5226 |
| <b>Credit Valley Conservation Authority</b> |      |
| Mrs Marland                                 | 5227 |
| <b>Midwifery</b>                            |      |
| Mr Hayes                                    | 5227 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|                              |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Jobs Ontario Training</b> |                  |
| Mrs McLeod                   | 5227             |
| Mr Cooke                     | 5227             |
| <b>School curriculum</b>     |                  |
| Mrs McLeod                   | 5228             |
| Mr Cooke                     | 5229             |
| <b>Ontario Hydro</b>         |                  |
| Mr Harris                    | 5230             |
| Mr Wildman                   | 5230             |
| <b>Social assistance</b>     |                  |
| Mr Harris                    | 5231             |
| Mr Silipo                    | 5231, 5233, 5235 |
| Mr Bradley                   | 5233             |
| Mr Gary Wilson               | 5235             |
| <b>Water quality</b>         |                  |
| Mr Offer                     | 5232             |
| Mr Wildman                   | 5232             |

## Environmental commission office

|                             |      |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Mr Tilson                   | 5232 |
| Mr Laughren                 | 5232 |
| <b>Gambling</b>             |      |
| Mr Hope                     | 5233 |
| Ms Churley                  | 5233 |
| <b>Fire safety</b>          |      |
| Mrs Marland                 | 5234 |
| Ms Gigantes                 | 5234 |
| <b>Payments to teachers</b> |      |
| Mr Ruprecht                 | 5235 |
| Ms Ziemba                   | 5235 |

## PETITIONS

|                            |      |
|----------------------------|------|
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>  |      |
| Mr Daigeler                | 5236 |
| Mr Cousens                 | 5236 |
| Mr Callahan                | 5237 |
| Mr Sola                    | 5238 |
| <b>Violence</b>            |      |
| Ms Poole                   | 5236 |
| <b>Haemodialysis</b>       |      |
| Mr Murdoch                 | 5236 |
| Mr Jim Wilson              | 5237 |
| <b>Pay equity</b>          |      |
| Mr Cooper                  | 5236 |
| <b>Taxation</b>            |      |
| Mrs Caplan                 | 5236 |
| <b>Firearms safety</b>     |      |
| Mr Jordan                  | 5237 |
| Mr Runciman                | 5238 |
| <b>Education financing</b> |      |
| Mr Cooper                  | 5237 |
| <b>Ontario Stock Yards</b> |      |
| Mr Ramsay                  | 5237 |

## Ministerial response

|                               |      |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Mr McLean                     | 5238 |
| <b>Highway signs</b>          |      |
| Mr McLean                     | 5238 |
| <b>Land-lease communities</b> |      |
| Mr O'Connor                   | 5238 |

## FIRST READINGS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>City of Kitchener Act, 1994, Bill Pr95,</b> |      |
| <i>Mr Cooper</i>                               |      |
| Mr Cooper                                      | 5238 |
| Agreed to                                      | 5238 |

## GOVERNMENT NOTICE OF MOTION

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Interim supply, Mr Laughren, notice of</b> |      |
| motion number 23                              | 5238 |
| Mr Laughren                                   | 5239 |
| Mr Phillips                                   | 5239 |
| Mr Tilson                                     | 5248 |
| Mr Sutherland                                 | 5248 |
| Mr Mahoney                                    | 5248 |
| Mr McLean                                     | 5249 |
| Mr Stockwell                                  | 5249 |
| Deemed adjourned                              | 5262 |

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 29 mars 1994

## DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Conseil scolaire de langue française</b> |      |
| <b>d'Ottawa-Carleton</b>                    |      |
| M. Beer                                     | 5225 |



No. 105

N° 105

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 30 March 1994

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mercredi 30 mars 1994



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

*50th anniversary*

*1944–1994*

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 30 March 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 30 mars 1994

The House met at 1333.

Prayers.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS CLOSING OF CAMPGROUNDS

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** For the past three years I have been working with local officials to lobby the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation to approve some sort of an agreement which would reopen the parks of the St Lawrence Parks Commission that were closed by the commission.

Raisin River and Charlottenburgh parks have attracted investors from the private sector who want to make an economic contribution to the area by leasing these campground areas and paying a percentage of revenue back to the province. There is no doubt that the economic spinoff would be great. Students are also looking for summer jobs, but they won't get them at these parks if the government doesn't act immediately to allow the private sector to invest the capital and draw the tourists.

People in eastern Ontario are tired of NDP ministers talking about partnership and then refusing to even meet with municipal officials, union representatives and individuals who want to see the parks open for this summer.

The Premier, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation have all told me they're aware of the importance to the tourism sector. However, they can't be that interested in tourism since OPSEU sent an alternative proposal to the government last fall, but again there has been no response. The union is fully supportive of these parks being open.

I urge the minister to meet with the local municipal governments, the union and the private sector so that these parks can be reopened this summer.

## HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** My statement is directed to the Minister of Education and Training on behalf of many concerned students, faculty, support staff and citizens at our universities.

Last October, the ministry published its Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities. Colleges and universities were asked to review their harassment and discrimination policies and procedures using the ministry policy framework and submit them to the ministry by March 1, 1994.

Many university professors and students have reacted with anger, claiming the policy is flawed and that the term "zero tolerance" is inappropriate and could lead to jeopardizing academic freedom. They claim that with rules like this in force, it's hard to imagine forthright discussions on many controversial issues as they may trigger formal complaints.

This afternoon, I will introduce petitions that have been signed by over 200 faculty members and students from the University of Western Ontario. They state:

"Although firmly committed to ending discrimination of all sorts, we view the Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities as an infringement on traditional university autonomy and a threat to academic freedom."

Minister, universities and colleges are also concerned with issues surrounding harassment and discrimination, but had already developed policies on their own without the interference of this government. You have managed to turn what used to be a situation under control into a chaotic mess.

## YOUNG VOICES REPORT

**Ms Zanana L. Akande (St Andrew-St Patrick):** I rise today to praise the work of Ontario youth.

As part of the work of the Premier's Council on Health, Wellbeing and Social Justice, more than 200 children and youth from communities across this province were involved in identifying the important issues which affect their lives and require change and resolution. Issues such as educational funding, the need for health information, violence, housing, transportation and employment, to name a few, were identified, addressed and recommendations made in this report, Young Voices.

Certain facts are important to emphasize:

—These consultations and discussions with children and youth were conducted by youth, and this report reflects their own ideas and their own recommendations towards solutions.

—The report also contains a description of some of the initiatives that the youth themselves have taken within their communities to effect change. This demonstrates that they are not depending totally on government and other institutions to do this.

—But the report emphasizes repeatedly the youths' desire to be involved in the solutions to the issues that concern them, not just as a group to be consulted after the decisions are made but sitting at the table, wrestling with the issues, with an equal part in those decisions.

We have heard the voices of children and youth. The question remains, will we listen?

## RETAIL SALES TAX

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** I want to once again raise the issue of the Minister of Finance's decision to impose a new tax on the wine and beer made at brew-on-premises operations in Ontario. This tax of 26 cents per litre on the beer or wine a customer makes for himself or herself is having a devastating impact on the you-brew operators.



The numbers have been in for some time now and the minister will be quite familiar with them. You-brew operators across Ontario are reporting that since the imposition of the tax on August 1 last year, sales volumes have dropped by 50%, and that in these terrible times of high unemployment, over 400 people have been laid off.

Another tragic aspect of this new tax is that it's killing something we ought to be nurturing to the very best of our ability in Ontario: a small business industry which had actually been thriving in the recession.

The new tax isn't even accomplishing the government's objective of bringing in additional revenues. Revenues have dropped by one half since the new tax was put in place.

I'm asking the minister once again to act responsibly in this matter by removing this tax and by at the very least imposing a moratorium on the two additional taxes he has on his schedule to hit the you-brews.

1340

#### ELMVALE MAPLE SYRUP FESTIVAL

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** Another exciting event in Simcoe East: The people of the township of Springwater are ready, willing and able to invite everyone to the 28th annual Elmvale Maple Syrup Festival and the third annual arts, crafts and antique show on April 15 and 16.

Ontario farmers know that "frosty nights and warm sun make the maple syrup run" at the second largest maple syrup festival in the province.

The 28th annual Elmvale Maple Syrup Festival gets under way Friday, April 15, with a variety night featuring local talent at Elmvale District High School.

Join with family and friends on Saturday, April 16, for pancakes and maple syrup at the community hall. Take free bus trips to the sugar bush and the arts, crafts and antique show. Midway rides are available for kids of all ages. Visit vendors and displays on the main street and enjoy a full day of dancing and displays and music.

Last year the log-sawing contest was an exciting event. Last year the winners were myself and the reeve of Essa township. I'll tell you, we can sure cut off a piece of wood when we need to.

The maple syrup festival wraps up on Saturday night with two grand dances, an adult dance at the community hall and a teen dance at the Elmvale District High School.

The village of Elmvale is located at the junction of Highways 27 and 92 in Simcoe county. For more information on the 28th annual maple syrup festival, you can call 705-322-3183. The sap is boiling, skies are clear and maple syrup time is here.

#### PANORAMA PROGRAMS

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** This week several communities in Cochrane North have been the focus of TVOntario's Panorama. Panorama is TVOntario's French-language flagship current affairs and arts series. Each night, Monday to Thursday at 7 pm, Panorama tackles one of the many big burning issues of the day, and in Cochrane North four special programs will be completed

on how the towns of Cochrane, Kapuskasing, Hearst and Timmins are faring economically, socially and culturally in current times.

Starting on Monday, series host Adrian Cantin and his team reported from Timmins on the economic impact the mining industry will have on northern Ontario beyond the year 2000. They visited Malette Inc's premier sawmill—it also operates a sawmill in Hearst—and its kraft pulp mill in Smooth Rock Falls.

On Tuesday, program highlights included Norbord, a plywood manufacturer, and Nord-Aski, an organization that encourages economic development in the Hearst community.

Today, there's a special interview taking place with Frank Dettori and Norm Leybourne, respectively president and union coalition leader of Kapuskasing's Spruce Falls Inc. They will discuss how the employees bought the faltering pulp and paper mill to keep it from closing. This part of the series will be broadcast live from Kapuskasing at 7 this evening on TVOntario.

Tomorrow, viewers will discover Hearst's École Clayton Brown, the only school in Ontario with three official languages: English, Cree and French.

Interviews will be conducted in French and English with some subtitles. Each program will also feature performances by local musicians.

Today, Peter Herrndorf, TVOntario's chairman and chief executive officer, will be in Kapuskasing to meet with the people in the community and discuss La Chaine's many programming initiatives that serve Ontario's diverse francophone population.

Tonight, turn into TVOntario at 7 pm and watch the program.

#### CASINO GAMBLING

**Mr Carman McClelland (Brampton North):** Mr Speaker, I want to take a moment of your and my colleagues' time and comment on the ever evolving and changing policy of the government with respect to casino gambling. Not only do they sort of roll the dice and say, "What are we going to do today? Cut the cards and see what cards we're going to play tomorrow"; there's a sense of not knowing where we're going to go.

The minister on the one hand says, "We're only going to have a pilot project and it will run for a while and we'll see how it goes." Then they float stories that maybe it will go in Niagara Falls, particularly if it's politically expedient. Maybe we'll go to teletheatres. We know that there are some circles that would want to see that expand at a great rate. Perhaps video lottery terminals are next on the agenda, and who knows what will happen after that.

Last week, I asked the minister how much the estimates were for the renovations for the interim interim casino, which in all probability, with the back wall being knocked out and costs escalating, may very well become a permanent casino. We'll wait and see on that. That's my latest prediction, and so far we've been fairly accurate.

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** Wrong.

**Mr McClelland:** She says, "Wrong," but she was wrong about other things before. We asked what was the cost, and she didn't know, notwithstanding the fact she was in charge of that at the time, and referred it to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. She very kindly indicated to me that the initial costs were estimated at about \$6.5 million, but now they're about \$11.5 million. That was last week. This week they're about \$12.5 million or \$13 million. Next week, who knows?

The whole policy with respect to casinos evolves on a day-to-day basis. We would hope the government would give us some certainty and some exactitude, that the people in this province would know what the government's plans are and that they don't change from day to day and from whim to whim.

#### WETLANDS

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** This statement is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Minister, your wetlands policy has abrogated property rights and destroyed property values. Under this policy, private property is identified and classified as a wetland. The municipality is then given a map outlining the area and it must designate that wetland and a 120-metre buffer zone within which all development is frozen. Without any prior consultation, the property owners suddenly discover that their land has been rendered worthless.

This policy is a clear example of how this government assumes control but evades responsibility. While the ministry can declare an area significant for the ecosystem, it does not see the land as being significant enough to cover the costs incurred by the owner. The net effect of the wetlands policy is that of expropriation without consultation or compensation, and it is an absolute affront to Ontario's democratic recognition of property rights.

The ministry must consult property owners and local government to determine if lands should be classified. If land must be protected, all stakeholders should be consulted relative to the value of the land, multiple uses, and possible compensation.

#### DON VALLEY BRICKWORKS

**Mr Gary Malkowski (York East):** I'm very pleased to announce that our government has contributed \$2.25 million from the Jobs Ontario Capital fund towards the restoration and regeneration of the Don Valley Brickworks located in East York. Funding of this project is in partnership with the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and augmented by private funding through the Conservation Foundation of Greater Toronto.

About 10 years ago, this part of the Don Valley was in danger of being developed for housing, but people like Jeffrey Smyth and Charles Sauriol, members of Friends of the Valley, felt that this land should belong to the public because of its historical, environmental and archeological significance. This week's announcement marks the beginning of a crucial phase in the Don Valley restoration.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those people who made this vision a reality. In addition to the Friends of the Valley, I want to mention the efforts of members of the Brickworks Task Force, the Don Water-

shed Task Force and the Metro Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. It is by the support and persistence of these community members that we now have a plan to create a park at this site and preserve its important historical and natural features.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Mr Speaker, I believe there's been some discussion among House leaders that would give all of us in the House today an opportunity—

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Actually, one from each party.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —one from each party—to express our gratitude to Bud Tangney, who's retiring as the deputy clerk of the executive council.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Agreed? Agreed.  
BUD TANGNEY

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Perhaps it's appropriate, on a day on which there's discussion of activities within the cabinet, to reflect on Bud Tangney's retirement as the deputy clerk of the council and as the person, as all people who have been in the cabinet will know, who basically runs the meetings, who keeps count of all the organizational work in the government in terms of the management of cabinet minutes, the management of orders in council, the management of the business of cabinet and of its committees. Bud Tangney today is being recognized in this Legislature for the wonderful job he's been doing on behalf of the people of the province.

It was a wonderful celebration a few short weeks ago when former Premier Davis and I had an opportunity to congratulate Bud on his many years of service and on his incredible dedication to the people of the province.

Bud Tangney is a very distinguished graduate of the Lindsay Collegiate Institute as well as of the University of Western Ontario, where he received his master of business administration in 1964. He worked for the University of Toronto, where he was an active participant in the International Student Centre and in the registrar's office, where he worked just as I was arriving there. But I think I know many of the people whom he worked with, who are very distinguished and fine people.

He then went on to become an administrative trainee in six different ministries. He then was an economist-researcher and an executive assistant to the deputy minister. In 1974, he became secretary to the cabinet committee on social development. Then he was coordinator of operations. Then he was also deputy clerk of the executive council. And from 1985 to 1990, as all of you will know, Bud Tangney has been director of cabinet operations, deputy clerk of the executive council, special assignments, and since 1990, as I say, we all know he's been serving this government as well with enormous distinction and with great ability.

1350

It really is a pleasure for me to say that coming fresh into government as we did in 1990, to have the steady hand, good guidance and tremendous sense of public service of Bud Tangney was, I can tell him, as I've told him on other occasions, a tremendous source of support to us all. Bud Tangney doesn't have the opportunity to speak in cabinet meetings but now that he's retired, I'm



sure that he will in conversation be able to remind many of us of the remarkable similarities as well as the contrasts in experience.

He has truly been present at some very dramatic and emotional occasions. I'm sure he will want to reflect on some of those, but members of the Conservative Party who served with him will know some of the historic decisions that were taken. He served the province extremely well in the transition from the Davis to the Miller premiership, from the Miller to the Peterson premiership and, as I say, in terms of the transition to our own government in 1990, he was an absolute consummate public servant.

I want to take this opportunity to wish him and Barbara well on this occasion, and to say that he's not widely known. If you were to ask reporters or television journalists, "Who is this man?" as he emerges from cabinet meetings, I'm sure many of them wouldn't know, but he is representative of the very, very fine public service that we have in this province, of the extraordinary professional dedication which has been shown by them in some major political transitions which have occurred since the 1980s. He has served each government with tremendous loyalty, with consummate good judgement and with enormous professionalism. The fact that government works at all owes a tremendous amount to Bud Tangney and to the thousands of people like him.

On behalf of my colleagues in the government, those of us who have served with him, those of us who have gotten to know him, I want to say we shall miss you, we appreciate the work that you've done on behalf of the people of the province and we wish you and your wife a marvellous retirement and an opportunity to do some of the things which we have successfully prevented you from doing for all these many years. Good luck, Bud, and thank you very much for your years of service.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** It's a pleasure and an honour for me to say a few words on behalf of the Liberal caucus today.

I knew when I first met Bud that I liked him, although he did at one point, as I was Minister of Health, I remember, require us to go through those onerous processes all the way through all those committees; always made us do what was proper and correct. Sometimes I had some reluctance, I guess, to follow some of his directions, just because I was in a hurry, but then when I looked at his CV and found out that he'd been trained at the University of Western Ontario, I quickly and most completely complied with his great judgement and his valuable skills in making sure that the world was operated properly.

As a graduate of the same institution, we quickly, I think, got to know each other and understand each other very well and I think his good common sense and good judgement, having come from the University of Western Ontario, has certainly played a major role in bringing good sense and judgement to the cabinet area.

I was a cabinet chair for a little bit of time during our government, and I'll tell you, it was a great comfort to know that when things got to us they were properly there and in most cases the i's were dotted and the t's were

crossed and when we had finished our meetings all of the steps that should be taken were taken, because there was a watchful eye, if not anybody who was there prompting the work to be done, someone who knew what had to be done to make sure that the business of the province was done in a proper and correct fashion—not involved in the policy, but when you took a policy decision, it was there to be done properly.

If anybody wanted to call on how many days you needed after a regulation was passed or how many days it would be before the order in council was posted, the wealth of knowledge was just at hand in that very cabinet office. For that, Bud, we thank you very, very well indeed.

He comes from Lindsay, I understand, and that, of course, is a marvellous sense of small-town Ontario represented in the very heart of the government of the province, and I think it probably explains a lot about why there was such a meticulous care to detail, so much of a dedication to professionalism that Bud brought to his station.

I'm always going to remember, I guess, that in the midst of all the really big decisions and big discussions that were carried on, when we were in cabinet, there was always one calm oasis in the entire area and that was around Bud Tangney's chair and desk, because he had to make sure that while the rest of us were all flying off in discussions on this issue or that issue and getting up and answering phones, sitting down and bringing papers in, order was the way the ultimate decision was communicated.

I have to say to Bud, in some ways I guess it would be great if you could tell everything. I know that's not in your mandate or your character. But at the same time, he has been through a tremendous series of great provincial movements in terms of policy implementation and discussion. He's seen it all. I think, in fairness, he really has seen it all and he has been there to oversee but not to tell what has been going on in the province of Ontario.

With those few shaking fingers on the other side, I wish I could apply for Bud's job. I would really like to be there even now as we go through some of these issues.

Bud, to you, from somebody who's in politics and who hadn't been involved in it from the government side until 1985, who didn't really understand all there was to know, I can tell you that your strength and your determination to be highly professional and to be quietly guiding in making sure things were done correctly was a great help to me, and I'm sure it was for the rest of us who were in government with the Liberal caucus from 1985 through the end of September 1990.

It was always a sense that things were going to be done properly and that we could have our head and do our discussion the way it should be done, but at the end of the day it would all work out just fine in terms of the technical side of government.

You have tremendous experience, and perhaps you will be doing some writing, or whatever, with respect to how things should be done and how they have been done. If that's in your future plans, I wish you very well indeed.

We wish you personally, to you and Barbara, the very best of times, and I hope, because I can't imagine you not doing something, that you will be successful in what you and Barbara choose to do. Please have a very long and happy retirement.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** It's my pleasure to wish Barbara and Bud a happy retirement as well on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario. You know, Mr Speaker, one of the things that I find amazing, and have found amazing over the last 16 years that I've been in government, is the loose use of the word "secretary." We use the word "secretary" for just about everybody in the government. We have principal secretaries to opposition leaders; we have secretaries to cabinet; we have secretaries to cabinet committees; we have secretaries of all different kinds and functions. To the layman, the word "secretary" means somebody who actually organizes and keeps things in order and makes certain that the t's are crossed and the i's are dotted and the records are kept in an orderly fashion.

I want to tell the people of Ontario that the real secretary of the provincial government of Ontario for the past 15, 16 years has been Bud Tangney. It hasn't been all these other people who carried that particular title. At least that's what most of the people in Ontario would understand. Bud is an extremely well-organized individual who has been loyal to his masters, whoever they be. I'm sorry for you in the last 10 years, Bud, but notwithstanding that, he has done a good job for all three governments which he has served, under three parties.

During my period in cabinet from 1981 to 1985, only Bob Welch and Bud Tangney saw eye to eye with me. Although Bud is small in physical stature, he is huge in stature among all of us who have had the pleasure to serve with him. I wish you the very best, Bud and Barbara, in your retirement.

1400

#### ORAL QUESTIONS GOVERNMENT'S AGENDA

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** I have in my hand a cabinet document from the Rae government, a document of just a few days ago. This cabinet document makes it very plain that the Rae government has developed an action plan for the dying days of its desperate mandate, and I'm not surprised that some senior official in either a minister's or a deputy minister's office leaked this document, because I'll tell you, this tells us how far the saints have fallen.

I want to say to the Premier, it is very clear from this document that all work in the Ontario government for the remaining days and weeks and months of this mandate of your government will be set aside and only those items which support your re-election are going to receive any kind of priority attention: page after page after page after page confirming that the only principle left in the Rae government at this point is its re-election.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Conway:** Can the leader of the government

confirm that this cabinet document of a few days ago is in fact the policy of his government for the remaining part of this mandate?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I perhaps could return the favour by referring to the feverish fumbblings of a frustrated opposition. One form of alliteration is as good as another.

I would say to the honourable member that if he objects to the government focusing on jobs, if he objects to the government clearly focusing its efforts in terms of the things that we have to do as a government on behalf of the people of the province, if he objects to a government setting priorities and deciding that there are some things that have to be done sooner rather than later, if he objects to getting a clear sense in the public of the fact that the government is focusing its efforts on improving the economy, on simplifying, if you will, the work of government, then I could only say to him, let him stand up in his place and say that's what he objects to.

What citizen of the province could possibly object to a government which is focusing its efforts, to a government which puts jobs clearly first and which asks ministries to bear that in mind in the work that they do? If he objects to the construction of subways, to the establishment of the capital corporations, to the work that's under way—

**The Speaker:** Could the Premier conclude his reply, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —if he objects to the kinds of things that are under way, to addressing the issue of employment equity in terms of its administration and its management, if he objects to these questions, then let him stand in his place and say so.

I can't see what citizen could possibly object to the fact that this government has got its act together. We know what we're doing, we know where we're going, and we think it's a good direction for the province.

**Mr Conway:** Three and a half years ago, when the Rae government met this House for the first time, on November 20, 1990, Bob Rae told the province that politics under his administration was all about what we owe one another; that politics in the world of Bob Rae, politics in Bob Rae's Ontario, was about earning the trust and the respect of the people of Ontario; that politics in government in Bob Rae's Ontario was guarding against institutional arrogance and the abuse of power.

Now, three and a half years later, we have this cabinet document which indicates that the only principle left is re-election. If it doesn't support re-election, forget it; we're not going to do it.

My supplementary is, a key part of this plan, this most cynical plan, is how—let me read from the document. "A critical challenge facing this government will be managing expectations relating to those initiatives which we will not be pursuing." The document goes on at some length to explain how the government is going to take valuable public sector time and resources to manage the damage because of broken promises.

In this cynical, Mulroney-like manipulation, my question to the Premier is: Do you have the guts to



directly communicate with all of those people and all of those groups and all of those communities with whom you have broken faith and with whom you intend to break faith to tell them that they're on your B, C and D lists and that they will not get any consideration between now and the next election?

**Hon Mr Rae:** If one wants to engage in a discussion about cynicism, I would be more than happy to do that. But let me say directly to the honourable member, whose rhetorical flights of fantasy exceed even the rational and the reasonable in terms of the interpretations here, if you're opposed to focusing—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for Ottawa West is out of order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —if you're opposed to the government focusing and saying that that's what we need to do, that's what government needs to do, if you're opposed to a cabinet setting clear priorities, if you're opposed to our saying there are things that have to be done right away and there are some things that are more difficult for us to do, either because we don't have the money or because it's unreasonable to do, I know we have an opposition over there which is going to be promising everything to everybody for as long as they're there, everything to everybody. Every concern, every grievance, everything that's out there, you'll be arousing all that.

All we're saying is that we're going to have to deal effectively with the people of the province in terms of the issues we have to address. We are clearly putting the jobs issue at the very top of our priority list, because that is where we believe the majority of the people of this province want their government to be, and that's what we have to focus on.

The people of the province also understand that there will always be more good ideas, by definition, than there is money to pay for them. When you're in government, you have to make the difficult decisions and say, "Here is where the focus is going to be."

**The Speaker:** Would the Premier conclude his reply, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** That's what being in government is all about.

1410

**Mr Conway:** The author of this cynical and manipulative document, which among other things contains sample letters for the ministers and the deputy ministers to send out to those people with whom the government has broken faith, is none other than the Premier's long-time friend and campaign manager, David Agnew. It's obvious from this document that David Agnew remains in March 1994 what he was four years ago, Bob Rae's campaign manager.

We have said before, and I will repeat now, that your appointment and your maintenance of your good friend and confidant, David Agnew, as secretary of the cabinet while he plots your election campaign is a corruption of the public service.

My question to Bob Rae, the self-appointed saint of Ontario politics, is twofold: Will you today remove your

campaign manager, David Agnew, from his \$135,000 public service salary and put him over at NDP central and let him run the campaign from there? And will you, if you feel so buoyant and so confident about your record as the fourth year of your mandate concludes, submit your record, call an election in this province and let the people of Ontario decide?

**Hon Mr Rae:** First of all, with respect to his preliminary comments, I think all members of the House recognize that from time to time the honourable member opposite shows he's really incapable of rising above this kind of character assassination as a way of resolving the issues. That seems to be the approach he always takes.

The second thing I would say is that no doubt it was his advice which caused his predecessor to call an election after three years. I have no intention of following that particular advice.

Let me make one last point. The people of the province, when it comes to cynicism and when it comes to judging how politics work in the province, I think will always remember the name of the political party that told the people there was a perfectly balanced budget when it had a budget in the spring of 1990, and then in the middle of the election campaign chose to announce a tax change which it thought would buy votes, and then was singularly repudiated on election day. I don't need to take any lessons on the subject of integrity from the member for Renfrew North, ever, ever, ever.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** From the handbook on how to break promises to a broken promise, to the minister in charge of auto insurance: He promised the public that the increases in auto insurance would only be, at maximum, 4%. The result is in. The increases are well beyond the double-digit figures. I want the minister to tell us what he intends to do about that.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** I very much appreciate the question from the member across the way. Unfortunately, his question is an extremely confused question. This minister stood in this House last fall and announced publicly to this House that we had reached an agreement with the insurance industry for a maximum 5% rate increase this year as a result of Bill 164, and no company in this province has exceeded that 5% increase.

**Mr Elston:** The minister is really going to have to explain to my constituents and the people across the province, then, what it is that makes up what is looking like more towards 17%, 18%, 19%, 20% increases in auto insurance. He is going to have to account for all the scuttlebutt out in the areas in my part of the province that indicates that Bill 164 is contributing to a substantial part of that 18% increase. Indeed, people are being required to pay more for considerably less. In fact, if they take any part of the policy which will allow them to have a policy that covers their lost income as a result of injuries, the increases will be in the neighbourhood of \$200, \$300, \$400 and \$500 more in price.

I want the truth from this minister. Why did you break the promise, and why are you making the people of this

province pay for your broken promise?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Not only did this government not break its promise, but the member across the way has asked for the truth, so let us deal clearly and straightforwardly with the truth.

There is a handful of people in the province of Ontario whose policies were being renewed in January, February and March of this year who got caught by a double hit, who got caught by the 5% associated with this government's legislation and who got caught by an 8% to 11% associated with the Ontario motorist protection plan, because the companies didn't implement their increases last year until March.

All of the increases last year were a result of the legislation which the Liberals passed in June 1990, and all of those increases are now coming home to roost for the people of this province. The member is going to have to explain that to his constituents, because I'm sure we will.

**Mr Elston:** It's interesting to note that there were no increases under OMPP from June 1990 until last year, that in fact the program was running rather smoothly until this minister started screwing around with it.

I want the minister to tell the people the truth, that the Minister of Finance added 8% to the cost of insurance premiums by putting the tax back on, and I want that minister to come clean with the seniors in this province on fixed incomes, whom they are requiring to pay 18%, 19% and 20% increases on their auto insurance premiums when he guaranteed, as the minister in charge of auto insurance, that there would be less than 4% increases for all causes.

What are you going to do about the fulfilment of your promises you have broken, just like the Premier is telling you ministers now to break the rest of them?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** The member across the way is obviously extremely exercised about truth, and the member across the way is going to get more exercised about truth as this story plays out.

1420

The member across the way is correct. There were no increases in OMPP until last year. As a matter of fact, in the fall of 1991, this minister sat down with the insurance industry in this province and negotiated decreases of 5%.

**Mr Elston:** Oh, sure, just like you negotiated to decrease the \$14-billion budget—a figment of your imagination.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Secondly, any of the major CEOs of the major insurance companies in this province would kindly and happily tell the member across the way that the 5% increase that impacted on residents of the province as a result of Bill 164 saved them from about 10% increases in 1994 as a result of OMPP and from about 15% increases in the following year as a result of OMPP. All of those insurance industry executives are clearly saying that Bill 164 and the work we did through the task force to stabilize price and cost in the industry will cause the rates in this province to be significantly stable in the future.

#### GOVERNMENT'S AGENDA

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Premier. Today we've heard the response to the member for Renfrew North, and we read in the Toronto Star, and we now all have the cabinet document. Anybody who has read this document, as the Toronto Star has concluded, can draw no other conclusion but that you have given up governing for the sake of electioneering. You cannot read this document, in my view, and not come to that conclusion. Many policies have been shelved.

I would ask you this simple question, Premier: How can you come to this Legislature today, how can you continue to collect your paycheque as Premier when you've clearly given up?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I would say to the honourable member, as I assume he's trying to ask a serious question, that he perhaps will tell me what it is he objects to in terms of focusing on jobs, because I understand that's what he's been telling us to do over and over again. I don't understand why that would be something that his party would object to.

He's out talking to people, talking about choices to the people of the province. So am I. I don't see anybody suggesting that he should give up his paycheque or that he should stop being the leader of the third party. I'd like him to continue to be leader of the third party for as long as is humanly possible.

I can tell the honourable member that I am enormously proud of my colleagues in government. We're very proud of the work we're doing as a government. I want to say, by the way, that I have been underestimated by many others before, and if he thinks this government is going to stop doing its best in trying to serve the people of the province, he is sadly mistaken. We are going to continue to do our best and we're going to continue to serve the people of the province, and I would call on the honourable member to do the same.

**Mr Harris:** First of all, the Premier should know, as I have stated on many occasions, that never have I underestimated Bob Rae, the Premier of the province today, and never will I underestimate him. What I am talking about is you giving up.

I would like you to answer this to the people of Ontario. You're collecting a paycheque from the people of Ontario; the taxpayers are paying you. I would like you to explain to those taxpayers who are paying your cheque to be Premier, how it is in their interests that you now suggest that the priority for cabinet time and for bureaucratic time, directed by your 1990 campaign manager, is to develop a communication strategy to explain to the people of Ontario why you are not going to do what you promised you were going to do. How is that in the interests of the people of Ontario, who are paying your salary?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I can honestly say that in any sessions in which I've talked with the people of the province or with my own colleagues, I haven't heard anybody saying that the solution to the problem is for this Premier to give up. Should I give up?

**Interjections:** No.



**Hon Mr Rae:** That's good enough for me.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say directly to the honourable member that when we look at the issues we're facing, when we worked through the weekend, as we did as a government, with respect to the Hydro situation; when we have dealt with business and labour on the reform of workers' compensation, which we've been working on intently, we're working all day Monday on; when we've been working to attract investment, as we've been doing across the province; when we've been working with people to build more; when we've been negotiating with Metropolitan Toronto for the construction of not two but four subway lines; when we've been working with community after community to retain jobs and to expand jobs, whether it's with Bombardier in Thunder Bay, whether it's with Algoma in Sault Ste Marie, whatever community it may be, there is work to be done and there are things that must be done on behalf of the people, and that is precisely why this government has given clear direction to the public service and to everyone else that jobs are number one.

That is the priority we must establish as we begin the work of getting this province clearly back on its feet and headed in the right direction.

**Mr Harris:** Let me agree with you on one thing, that people think jobs are the number one priority. Second, if you're prepared to take your question and challenge outside this Legislature, they think the number one job creation action you could take would be to quit, to give up, to call an election. That's what they tell me. That will create more jobs in this province than anything else.

Premier, let's talk about your priorities. You spent all your energy this week mud-slinging with the federal Liberals over an environmental office, but not once did I hear you say you were upset about the loss of 30 jobs.

You were upset about being blamed. You entered into the mud-slinging, but I never once heard you—you were concerned about being blamed—talk about the 30 jobs.

Your number one priority to create jobs, aside from quitting, should not be finger-pointing; it should be creating jobs right here in Ontario. There are things you can and you should be doing that will achieve this: cutting taxes instead of hiking them, repealing Bill 40, cutting regulation, putting a sign out saying, "We're open for business."

If you're not prepared to get on with these job creating measures in the province of Ontario, and on the basis of the priorities we see in this document and in the Toronto Star today, will you do the honourable thing and call an election?

**Hon Mr Rae:** The member refers to priorities and he refers to the document. Let me quote from the Toronto Star today:

"Category A: The highest-priority items on the government's agenda, which include jobs initiatives such as capital investments (subways, highways, Metro Convention Centre), Jobs Ontario Training programs, infrastructure programs, cutting red tape for small business and

strategies for international and interprovincial trade enhancement.

"Also included in this category is Workers' Compensation Board reform, social assistance reform, dealing with fraud in Ontario's health care system, drug benefit plan reforms, long-term care, an education reform package and employment equity implementation."

What is wrong with that? That's a good program, and that is a program not for an election; that's a program for governing, that's a program for implementation, and that's a program for doing.

With respect to his earlier point with respect to the federal government, let me say to the honourable member that I am proud to have defended this government against what Brian Mulroney did to Ontario, and I will be defending Ontario and the people of Ontario and this province.

Part of the task of any Premier is to defend the collective interests of this province because we have been so sorely and badly shortchanged by Tory and by Liberal administrations. I intend to stand and fight and defend the province of Ontario and defend all the people of the province of Ontario.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The leader of the third party with his second question.

**Mr Harris:** I concede that when it comes to slinging mud, you're the best, Premier. You're the best.

1430

#### HEAD-INJURY TREATMENT

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Minister of Health. Minister, as you know, OHIP has been paying for out-of-country care for head-injured Ontarians since the late 1980s. In fact, there are currently about 120 Canadians being treated in the United States.

Unfortunately, being in the States, away from family and friends, often lengthens the rehabilitation process. Recently, private sector clinics and treatment facilities have opened here in Ontario. Minister, can you explain why your government will pay for patients in private sector clinics in the United States, but you refuse to pay for private sector clinics in Ontario?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I would be delighted to, and to say to the member with a great deal of pride that we have created here in Ontario, over the last three years, public sector health care delivery systems that deal with people with acquired brain injury. In fact, we have spent \$7 million since 1990. We have enhanced the facilities in Thunder Bay and in Sudbury—these were announced last October—and we have a \$2.2-million facility now in Hamilton at Chedoke-McMaster.

I agree with the member. People in Ontario need to have those services here in Ontario, close to their friends, close to their families, and the practice of past governments of sending those people out of country to very expensive private sector clinics in the US is not one that our government wishes to follow any longer than we have to.

**Mr Harris:** You don't want to do it, it's not your

policy, but you do it. That's the question, why do you continue to do it?

My office spoke with Shirley Athoe. Her son, Mike McClary, is currently living at Anagram Centre in Niagara-on-the-Lake. Because your ministry will not pay to keep Mike at this private facility in Ontario, he will be forced to go to the United States, to a private facility, to access funding and to access care.

Private clinics such as Anagram, Progressive Rehabilitation Opportunities in Hamilton as well, are willing to take and have the expertise to take head-injured victims. But you have clearly declared "our preference for supporting not-for-profit health care providers." That's your rationale for paying and forcing these people to go to private sector clinics in the United States.

Why do you continue to force head-injured Ontarians to go south, when facilities exist right here in Ontario, with capacity and expertise, willing to take these people?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** There are some services that we are not yet in a position to offer in Ontario through our hospitals and through our rehabilitation systems. In those cases people continue to go south.

The policy of this government is to begin to rehabilitate and return those people to facilities in Ontario as part of our long-term care and our health care system. That's the progress we've made and that's how we will continue to spend public dollars.

**Mr Harris:** The members for Burlington South and Oakville South also have constituents at facilities in the United States. You are paying, you are wasting precious health care dollars for no other reason than some ideological reason.

While you sit on your hands, it costs \$500 more per day, on average, for every patient who goes to the United States for care. That's also payroll and jobs that are in the United States that could be right here in Ontario. That also is nearly \$200,000 per year more per patient that you are spending in the United States than taxpayers would have to pay for the jobs and having these facilities and patients closer to home here.

More important even than the jobs and the dollars are the great emotional and physical costs of being away from community and family and friends. Will you immediately withdraw your ideologically driven policy and provide more compassionate and less costly care right here in Ontario? Will you do this today?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** That is precisely what our government, as the first government in this province, has begun to do. We have begun to create those facilities here in Ontario, because we believe that's a part of our health care system that has been missing and that needs to be provided here, and we have put the money into the expansion of those services.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** Why are they in Detroit when they should be in Hamilton?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member for Parry Sound please come to order.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** As I said in my response to the second question, there are still some very specialized services that are not available here in Ontario. People

who need those services continue to go to the United States as we continue to expand both the range and the availability of services here in Ontario.

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** Name one service.

**The Speaker:** The member for Simcoe West, please come to order.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** That's our commitment and that's what we are continuing to do.

#### WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY AGENCY

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** My question is to the Minister of Labour. The Workplace Health and Safety Agency is in the process of shutting down three agencies currently delivering health and safety training throughout the province: the Care-Givers of Ontario Safety and Health Association, known as COSHA; the College, University and School Safety Council of Ontario, known as CUSSCO; and the Tourism and Hospitality Industry Health and Safety Education Program, known as THIHSEP. These three agencies are being closed down arbitrarily, unilaterally, and all three of them are being moved into the workers' centre for all future health and safety training.

Minister, people from all three areas, health care, education and tourism, are very, very upset at this unilateral action by the agency. Will you use your authority under the act and will you intervene and call a meeting of all the participants and try to resolve this dispute?

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** The member across the way should know that studies done in 1991 at the agency made the point that we could have more efficiency and less cost if we could amalgamate some of the 14 different delivery agencies we had. The joining of these three is part of that exercise. The member should also know that the recommendation was a bipartite recommendation that they come together.

I can tell you also that we have heard the arguments and the points being made that the member across the way raises, and the board will be dealing with that particular issue at its meeting, which I believe is today.

**Mr Mahoney:** I am just delighted with your answer that you would suggest that this decision was a result of a bipartite effort on the part of the health and safety agency.

Let me share with you, Minister, a letter dated March 28, just the other day, from the management caucus, all seven of them, signed by all seven members of this agency, of the management caucus. It is to your Batman and Robin of health and safety, Bob McMurdo and Paul Forder, the self-anointed CEOs and vice-chairs of this agency. It's to "Dear Mr McMurdo and Mr Forder." It says:

"We have not been kept fully apprised of the agency's activities in regard to the future of these organizations and are distressed that the agency appears to be operating without direction from the board of directors. We strongly oppose the action taken regarding COSHA, CUSSCO and THIHSEP until such time as this issue can be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of all stakeholders."

This is supposed to be the model for bipartite cooper-



ation between management and labour. The ship is sinking. Chaos exists at the health and safety agency. Cooperative bipartism, Minister, thanks to your bungling and inept work with this agency, has been destroyed.

Will you act now? Will you intervene? Will you exercise your authority as the Minister of Labour for this province and convene a meeting immediately of all interested parties to resolve this matter and try to save the bipartite process in the province of Ontario?

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** I have some difficulty in understanding why the member across the way would want this bumbling minister to now step in and resolve the problem. It just doesn't make any sense to me at all.

**Mr Mahoney:** Just get out of the way.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Mississauga West.

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** Let me also say that nobody is doing more damage to the institutions of the province of Ontario than the member across the way with the kind of hatchet attacks he's doing on both management and labour who chair this agency.

1440

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services and it concerns social assistance for 16- and 17-year-olds. Yesterday, in response to a question from the member for Nipissing, the minister said that in order for these teenagers to get welfare, "They have to demonstrate, and the worker must be satisfied, that there is an issue of abuse."

The minister is not informed of what's going on today, because today in Wellington county there is a 16-year-old girl receiving welfare who lives in a self-contained apartment attached to her parents' house. She collects welfare and pays rent to her parents.

She had applied for assistance from Wellington county social services but was denied by the county youth case worker, who found no evidence of abuse, not even an allegation of abuse. This young girl then appealed her denial to the Social Assistance Review Board, and without checking with our youth counsellor, Rico Sabatini, they ordered our county to pay her welfare until her appeal can be heard.

Will the minister explain to this House why he's allowing this to happen?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** Assuming that the information the member has given us on the particular instance is correct—and of course if he says that it is, then I assume that it is—in that particular instance I think that what he himself would conclude and can conclude from what he has just said is that the only thing that has happened so far is that the Social Assistance Review Board has ordered interim assistance, which is its full right to do under the legislation, pending a final determination on a full hearing of the case as to whether this individual is eligible for social assistance.

Everything seems to be in order in terms of what the member has indicated. There are clearly some broader

issues that, as I indicated yesterday, we are addressing. But I think in terms of a particular instance, that has been addressed and dealt with in the appropriate manner.

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** We have example after example after example where up to 12 months of welfare can be obtained on an interim basis, as the minister calls it, clearly knowing that "interim" is six to 10 to 12 months—10 months in this case.

The minister says, "If the information the member quotes is correct." It's quoted from a copy of a letter to you dated September 29, 1993, so you should know that the information is correct.

"It infuriates me"—this is from the counsellor, the social worker—"to know that in cases where I have contacted the parents, sometimes several times, spoken to doctors, youth workers, family counsellors and the client several times and can establish no special circumstances after hours of assessment, that the youth, by simply appealing and with no investigation, no follow-up, can get six to 10 to 12 months of welfare."

Minister, what we are finding out now is case after case of this. This is not an isolated case. The youth counsellor says, "I now have several other youths using the same strategy to get assistance," yet you say there isn't a problem.

I ask you this: Do you know of even one example—one, all across the province—where a 16- or 17-year-old who claimed he or she needed welfare was refused? Can you give us one example of that? If not, will you stop this silliness where every 16- and 17-year-old now in the province knows that they've got six to 10 to 12 months—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member complete his question, please.

**Mr Harris:** —without any verification of the allegations they make? Can you give me one case? If not, will you stop the abuse?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I have to say this: I find it really unfortunate that the members from the third party are choosing to deal with this issue, with what I think is a very delicate issue, in this kind of way.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Minister.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** At the risk of continuing to puncture the balloon of the third party with some straightforward information and facts, I'm going to try to continue to deal with this issue in the kind of calm way that I think we need to deal with it and in the kind of calm way that I think we were able to deal with it yesterday when the member for St Catharines addressed this very same issue in a question to me.

There is a problem. I have never denied that there is an issue and that there is a problem. I said that very clearly in the House yesterday. I've said that on other occasions publicly and privately. I think the approach we are taking to this issue is not to assume, as members of the third party seem to want to assume, that every single 16- and 17-year-old who is receiving social assistance is not entitled to receive social assistance.

What we are doing is trying to ensure that those young

people who legitimately have a right to receive social assistance are receiving it, and let's, for the record, be really clear about the number and the circumstances under which those young people can receive.

We have about 8,100 16- and 17-year-olds across the province who are presently in receipt of social assistance in this province. For them to be eligible to receive social assistance, the rules are that they have to be able to establish that there is some element of abuse that is going on.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** It is true—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I'll try. It is true that in terms of an interim situation, the Social Assistance Review Board has the right to order interim assistance, not on the basis of a full hearing but on the basis of whether it deems that there is financial hardship.

But I think, unlike the six- to eight- to 10- to 12-month time lines the leader of the third party was indicating, it's my very clear understanding—and I've had this discussion very directly with the chair of the Social Assistance Review Board—that they in fact have managed their workload down to the point where decisions are being rendered in a matter of weeks in instances like this, not in a matter of months. So I would ask the leader of the third party to update his information.

Having said all of that, I think we do acknowledge that there are problems in this area, and I've said to the members in this House that we are looking at this area to see what improvements we can make, from starting with setting out the rules in a very clear fashion to ensuring that they are being applied in a very consistent fashion.

**The Speaker:** Would the minister conclude his response.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I would conclude by saying we also agree that we have a responsibility to the taxpayers of the province, but we have to balance that responsibility with the responsibility that we have to a group of young people who may be legitimately in need and who may be suffering some form of abuse, and we have to also address that issue.

1450

**The Speaker:** The Minister of Environment and Energy has a response to a question asked earlier by the honourable member for Mississauga North.

#### WATER QUALITY

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** The member asked a question yesterday and I made a commitment that I would get back to him with the response.

As the member knows, the ministry for some time has been working with Uniroyal to identify contamination in the water system at the Grand River and to carry out a monitoring program under an existing control order for the rectification of the situation.

Shallow groundwater contamination at the local creek

has been identified in the past through investigative studies that were conducted under the control order issued in November 1991 by this ministry. This same order requires the company to contain and treat contaminated groundwater on the site before discharge to the creek. This contaminant system is to be installed this year. The water quality in the creek is expected to improve markedly with the installation and operation of the shallow groundwater containment and treatment system.

In direct response to the member's question, on March 28, Uniroyal Chemical Ltd advised the members of the Uniroyal public advisory committee at a meeting in Elmira of the results of a groundwater contamination investigative study begun in July 1993. The ministry staff had been previously informed of this study and its results on Wednesday, March 23. The ministry encouraged Uniroyal to make the results public as soon as possible.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Come on, Mr speaker, this is a statement for heaven's sake.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for Etobicoke West is out of order.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Uniroyal advised it would release the study results to the public at the Uniroyal public advisory committee on Monday the 28th.

**The Speaker:** Would the minister conclude his reply, please.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Yes. I just want to assure the member that the company will submit to the Ministry of Environment by the week of April 4 a feasibility study to address the toluene contamination and to ensure that there is a remediation plan put in place.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** By way of supplementary, I think it's clear to everyone that though the information for many in the community was made known just this week, it is also clear that the ministry knew there was an investigation and an examination being undertaken by Uniroyal as long ago as last February. They weren't advised what the results were but they knew something was going on in February 1994.

I would also like to say by way of supplementary that under your expenditure control plan, your government delayed the cleanup of the activities at Uniroyal. It was your government that cut funding that was previously allocated for the cleanup of this project and now, after you've delayed this matter, you restart the matter. That is just much too late. The people in the communities deserve more from the government. You took away the funding that was directed at not only Elmira, but also Smithville. You took it away under your expenditure control plan. It was your delay—

**The Speaker:** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Offer:** —which has caused this particular problem.

My question to you is, what do you say to the people of Elmira whose health and quality of life have been put at risk by your government's negligence in taking this issue seriously, by your reduction in the amount of money that should have been allocated to the cleanup in this area?



**Hon Mr Wildman:** The member is just completely wrong. The fact is that Uniroyal has been working with the ministry to do the studies that have determined the contaminant. As I indicated in my earlier remarks, despite the fact that the members of the third party don't care about the people of Elmira, the fact is that as a result of this study which was published within five days of the ministry becoming aware of it, at the ministry's encouragement of Uniroyal, the discovery of the material will now enable the company to remove much of the toluene by pumping and disposing of the material offsite, as required in the existing control order.

As a matter of fact, we are working with Uniroyal to respond to the genuine, serious concerns about water contamination that have been known for some time near Elmira and we are working to ensure that the people of Elmira's health and safety is protected.

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The Minister of Environment knows full well that the third party is very concerned about the people of Elmira and I would ask him to withdraw that statement.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** Mr Speaker, on the point of order: I just want to reiterate that when I was giving the answer about what was being done to assist the people of Elmira, there were choruses from the third party asking me to stop talking.

**The Speaker:** New question, the member for Mississauga North.

**Mr Offer:** I think the Minister of Environment and Energy will shortly know that his officials had first known of that investigation last February.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** No, that's not correct.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

#### GOVERNMENT SPENDING

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** My question is to the Chair of Management Board. Minister, last week your government announced a massive hike of tuition fees to students and their parents. I have been informed that in the same week, last week, your social contract secretariat took a two-day retreat to the Eaton Hall inn and conference centre in King City. This facility advertises the complete conference package: accommodation, hot breakfast, buffet lunch, dinner, morning and afternoon meeting break beverages, main meeting room, audio-visual equipment and full use of onsite recreation equipment and facilities.

These people in your ministry in this secretariat all work in the same building on the same floor, the same office at Queen's Park. What justification do you have for the spending of money on this junket?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board):** I'm not specifically aware of the event in question. I'll get the information and get back to the member.

**Mr Offer:** I hope the minister will also report back to this Legislature on this matter as to information we received that this junket was commandeered by a facilitator, Howard Fromkin of Johnston Smith Fromkin McCulloch, receiving \$1,800 a day for every day worked

in preparation for this junket.

Minister, I believe that you and your government have an obligation to this Legislature and to the people of this province. How is it that you can spend money wantonly on retreats and junkets of this kind on the same day, in the same week that you imposed a tax on every student and their parent in this province?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** I've said to the member that I will get the information in relation to the specific event and get back to the member.

In respect to the member's use of the word "junket," and the word "high-flyer" that some of his other colleagues used, and "excessive expenditure," in every single operational case that the Liberal Party of this province has raised, we've reduced spending by anywhere from 10% to 40% over what those characters across the way spent. During their term of office, they raised costs in those particular sectors by 40% to 60%. We don't need to take any lessons from them about good financial management.

#### HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** To the Minister of Transportation: Minister, you'll be aware that before the last federal election the Liberal member for Leeds-Grenville stated that he had full authority from Prime Minister Chrétien to announce that the Liberal federal government would pay one third of the cost of the completion of Highway 416. Have you entered into any talks with the federal government regarding the \$60 million or \$70 million that is forthcoming on the promise of the completion of Highway 416?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** I welcome the question from the member opposite vis-à-vis the need to have a high-quality access road to ease the congestion to our nation's capital. We don't receive, in terms of the national highway program, any participation from the federal government. We never did. Maybe when my phone doesn't ring, it must be Ottawa calling. Those people don't participate. We would welcome them, because we've earmarked \$34 million, 640 jobs this year, 1994. The overall cost of the project, 416 north and 416 south, is upwards of \$200 million.

What we're doing now is looking at presentations from two consortiums, but that's for the 407. Once we have made a decision on which one will get the contract, and it's the largest contract in North America, then we will be in a position to welcome the opportunity to create yet more jobs by way of a presentation from the private sector, channelled through the Ontario Transportation Capital Corp, and maybe some tolls, maybe a bit of users pay so we can accelerate the project, because we're looking at well over \$200 million.

#### 1500

**Mr Villeneuve:** There's supposed to be correspondence between the Minister of Transportation from Ontario and the federal Liberal government. The promise is there in black and white, \$60 million to \$70 million. The Premier, in his reply to the lead question from Mike Harris, the member for Nipissing, said highways were a number one priority.

You will know also that the federal Liberal government, in the announcement by the Deputy Prime Minister this week, was very generous to the province of Quebec, and it got the attention of Bob Rae, the Premier of Ontario.

This money has been promised. We have had deaths upon deaths on Highway 416. I keep sending you the clippings from the newspapers. I keep pleading with you personally and through correspondence. The money has been offered, Minister. Don't wait for your phone not to ring. The initiative is yours. Go after the money. Are you ready to do that?

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** If we're ready to do our job, to be at our post? We're funding 100%. If the federal government wishes to fund one third, half, it's like going to heaven only to get there and it's even better than you thought it was. Of course we will be at our post. We're looking at 4,000 jobs. You're right: It's high time that the federal Liberals honour a commitment with real cash. Put it on the table. Start treating Ontario like you're treating some other provinces—food for thought, and real cash for Ontarians to go to work.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The time for oral questions has expired.

#### USE OF QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: According to the rules, and I just want to bring this to your attention, there are a lot of members here on the government side, and we're entitled to some time during question period. I just want it noted for the record that they hogged all the time, the Liberals and the Conservatives, and we got no time. I would ask you to be more conscious of that in the future, because we have a right to ask some questions in this place as well.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** On the same point, the member for Bruce.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** If the member, who's been here since 1990, would read the standing orders, he would know that the response by the Minister of Environment and Energy to a question previously asked and which he was unable to answer is a time allocated to the New Democratic Party of this Legislative Assembly, and that member is wrong in saying that they didn't have any time at all.

**The Speaker:** To the member for Downsview, as by coincidence I was reviewing the time sheets this morning from the previous week, on balance what happens is that both sides utilize on some occasions a great deal more time than would be appropriate in order to accommodate more members. One day it may be a bit more on one side of the House than the other, but over a period of time it balances out. Today was probably a fairly typical example of some questions being too lengthy and some replies being too lengthy. All I can do is to encourage all members to make both questions and replies as short as possible.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think the members of the New Democratic side of this Legislature should also be aware

that in the future the minister of Management Board is also going to be taking some of their time because he was not able to respond to my question about the junket that the social contract—

**The Speaker:** The member does not have a point of order. The member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** In the spirit of goodwill, I would only ask that we give unanimous consent to allow the member for Downsview to ask his question.

**The Speaker:** The member has a point of order. Is there unanimous consent for the member for Downsview to pose a question?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** I heard at least one negative voice. The member for Parry Sound.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. I have recognized the member for Parry Sound.

#### MINISTER'S COMMENTS

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: Yesterday my colleague the member for Mississauga South attempted to raise a point of privilege with the Speaker with respect to comments made by the Minister of Housing. I believe that my colleague the member for Mississauga South had a bona fide point of privilege, but I wanted to obtain a copy of Instant Hansard before I addressed the issue myself in the Legislature. I was unable to obtain Hansard until late yesterday between 5 and 6 o'clock, and I was in a meeting at the time, so I have raised it at the first available opportunity. It is unfortunate that neither the minister nor the member for Mississauga South is here in the Legislature this afternoon—

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Why are you raising it now, then?

**Mr Eves:** Because, if you knew anything about the rules, sir, your smart-ass remark, you would know that you're supposed to raise a point of privilege—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. I will be pleased to listen to the honourable member's point of privilege after he has withdrawn the unparliamentary remark.

**Mr Eves:** I'd be more than happy to withdraw the unparliamentary language I used. As I was going to say, you're supposed to, from my experience around here, raise a point of privilege at the first available opportunity. That is why I'm raising it now.

I have had an opportunity to review Hansard, and I would suggest to the Speaker that the comments made by the Minister of Housing yesterday in response to a question from the member for Mississauga South are not only a breach of privilege but I believe contempt of the House as well.

As you may be aware, Mr Speaker, Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms acknowledges that attacks on individual members can constitute a breach of privilege. As well, Beauchesne's sixth edition, section 62,



quotes a Speaker's ruling as follows, "...in the context of contempt, it seems to me that to amount to contempt, representations or statements about our proceedings or of the participation of members should not only be erroneous or incorrect, but, rather, should be purposely untrue and improper and import a ring of deceit."

I would argue that the Minister of Housing's comments about the member for Mississauga South fit these definitions. To say that the member for Mississauga South "is attempting to stall, delay and impede" Bill 120 does a disservice to every member of this Legislature. Our role as parliamentarians, to quote Erskine May, "is to examine legislation, to have an opportunity to amend it and to propose alternatives."

To impute that the member for Mississauga South is not fulfilling her role as a member of this Legislature and to suggest that her actions are detrimental to the parliamentary process is a fundamental breach of the member for Mississauga South's privileges, in my opinion.

There is not one single bit of evidence to justify the statement made by the Minister of Housing. The minister was obviously imputing motive to the member for Mississauga South. She also stated an untruth. I am sure the Minister of Housing is well aware that all members of that committee who are dealing with Bill 120 agreed that the bill would not be proceeded with any further in committee until April 7. Knowing all these things, she still made the comment she made about the member for Mississauga South yesterday.

I would ask you to review the comments made by the Minister of Housing, to review the circumstances and I would ask you to treat this point seriously, please.

**Hon Brian Charlton (Government House Leader):** On the point of order, I, unfortunately, don't have a copy of yesterday's Hansard, but there are just a couple of issues in respect to this point of order that I'd like to deal with, and to deal with very briefly.

First of all, the member for Parry Sound has suggested that in the exchange that occurred yesterday between the Minister of Housing and the member for Mississauga South, the minister had imputed motives. If my recollection serves me correctly, at the time that exchange occurred, Mr Speaker, you quite rightly pointed out that there was a difference of opinion.

But the motive is not the accusation; the imputing of a motive is the reason for the accusation and not the accusation itself. The minister, as has been quoted by the member, suggested there was a delay. I think anybody who reasonably looks at the circumstances of that committee would suggest there had been a delay. We, the three House leaders, spent considerable time before Christmas allotting to this piece of legislation the longest amount of hearing and clause-by-clause time of any piece of legislation that was dealt with during the intersession.

1510

Having given that bill more time than any other, the bill finished in the intersession on clause 2. The comments of my colleague I think are a reflection of that fact, not the imputing of motive. Mr Speaker, I think that's the way in which you have to approach this

question. I didn't hear anything coming from my colleague suggesting what the member's motive for doing the things she was suggesting the member was doing was, simply that she was doing certain things.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I wasn't going to join in the discussion of the point of privilege that's been raised by the member for Parry Sound, but I do have to indicate quite clearly that the people in House leaders' meetings and other places clearly understood that we wouldn't be moving on this until April 7. We've discussed the items; we've been asked about 120. We have communicated on several occasions the issues of difficulty affecting the development of the—

**Hon Mr Charlton:** —progress was made by the end of the intersession.

**Mr Elston:** I'm sorry; I guess the member for Hamilton Mountain wasn't finished with his joining of the issue.

We knew quite a long time ago that this issue would take up some time. For the member for Hamilton Mountain to stand in his place and defend the Minister of Housing, who has accused another member of this Legislature of doing something with some deliberate purpose, which was obviously not the intent that the member for Mississauga South had on her mind at all, is in fact a breach of the privilege of a member by imputing a motive.

The words that are used are quite clearly on the record. I don't think you can be swayed by the interjections from the member for Hamilton Mountain in this case, because we all knew it was going to be an issue of some contention and we all knew it would take longer than other bills. That having taken place, it looks to me like I'm going to have to support the member for Parry Sound on this. I think it becomes a very serious issue when a minister can stand up at any time and accuse some member who is raising a reasonable issue to be enjoined here for discussion in the Legislature of doing it for a purpose of delaying the passage of a very important piece of legislation.

It seems to me that the member for Parry Sound has a point of privilege on behalf of the member for Mississauga South. I would ask you, as a result, to bring to the attention of the member for Ottawa Centre that she has transgressed the rules, ask her to issue the apology and then maybe we can move on with the business of the House.

**The Speaker:** May I say first to the honourable House leader of the third party that, as always, he makes a very thoughtful and thorough presentation of his point of privilege, which I appreciate. Indeed, he has raised it at the earliest possible moment. I appreciate also the suggestions and helpful information from both the government House leader and the House leader of the opposition. I will be pleased to take a look at Hansard, at the remarks which he speaks of, and to consider the points which he has brought to my attention.

May I say that in general I believe the member knows, as I believe all members know, that I take language quite seriously in this chamber and on occasion am quite

unhappy with the level of language that we unfortunately endure from time to time. When intemperate language is used, often it creates an even worse atmosphere and leads to unfortunate comments being made.

I always, as the member will recall from yesterday, allow the member who has been identified an opportunity, if he or she wishes, to withdraw remarks which have been found to be offensive to another member in the chamber. Obviously, at that point it's up to the member whether or not he or she wishes to withdraw.

I did not find the remarks at the time to be unparliamentary. However, I take very seriously the points that the House leaders brought to my attention. I will look at them and I will get back to the member as quickly as I can.

#### MEMBERS' PRIVILEGE

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I'm asking for your consideration, and I will be brief, in respect to this matter.

In reading the standing orders, and I may be the only one who is very concerned about this matter, under standing order 21 in respect of privileges, "Privileges are the rights enjoyed by the House collectively and by members of the House individually conferred by the Legislative Assembly Act and other statutes"—and, Mr Speaker, this is what I think is important, and perhaps I'm misinterpreting it—"or by practice, precedent, usage and custom."

Over the weekend, a matter was drawn to my attention and created significant concern with me as a member of this House for almost 13 years, something which in my view was unprecedented. That was a report in the Toronto Star, a column by Mr Thomas Walkom, which was a detailed report on what transpired in a recent meeting of the executive council.

Clearly, the Premier was quoted; members of the executive council were quoted. There was obviously a breach of cabinet confidentiality, a breach of the oath of secrecy which is taken by all members of the executive council upon entering cabinet.

I am personally very concerned about this unprecedented breach, Mr Speaker. I would ask you to consider this and take it under consideration if indeed it is a violation of the privileges of members of this assembly.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for Leeds-Grenville raises an interesting point and one which I will be very pleased to take a look at. In addition to the member for Parry Sound, he's given me some work to do this afternoon and this evening, and I will be delighted to take a look at it.

#### PETITIONS

##### WCB PREMIUMS

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly, and specifically to Premier Bob Rae. It reads as follows:

"Our company cannot afford to pay exorbitant Workers' Compensation Board rate increases at a time of economic hardship and wasteful compensation board expenditures. The financial viability of Ontario industry

has been put at risk by the Ontario Workers' Compensation Board. Our company will consider withholding any rate increase due in April 1994 unless the Workers' Compensation Board can guarantee that there will be no operating deficit this year.

"We request that the Office of the Premier intervene at the Workers' Compensation Board by forcing the board to act to stem this crisis."

This is signed by 181 employers in Ontario who are members of the Employers' WCB Crisis Committee, 446 Dupont Street in Toronto, Ontario.

##### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas several patients from the town of New Tecumseth are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments in Orillia or Toronto;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in New Tecumseth and one patient is forced to pay for her own nurse;

"Whereas the government continues to insist that they are studying the problem, even though they have known about it for two years;

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in New Tecumseth and Collingwood,

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of New Tecumseth."

I've signed that petition, and I obviously agree with it.

##### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It reads:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act now and restructure the way in which municipal and provincial tax dollars are apportioned so that Ontario schools are funded not only fully, but with equity and equality."

##### VIOLENCE

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I have 56 petitions, containing 598 signatures, sent in by St Rita's Catholic Women's League. I'd like to read it for the benefit of the Legislature.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;

"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to admire or emulate, but



rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

These petitions are sent from the towns of Hagersville, Jarvis, Victoria, Simcoe, Woodstock, Norwich and Burgessville. I'm very pleased to affix my signature to these.

1520

#### HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION POLICIES

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** I have a petition from the University of Western Ontario on prevention of harassment and discrimination and on free inquiry and expression which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned faculty and staff members of the University of Western Ontario, firmly reject the Ontario Ministry of Education and Training's Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities.

"Further, we call upon the minister, Mr David Cooke, to withdraw this document immediately. Although firmly committed to ending discrimination of all sorts, we view the Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities as an infringement on traditional university autonomy and a threat to academic freedom."

This petition has been signed by hundreds of faculty and staff and some alumni. I've added my name to it.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide the needed protection of owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and the owners of modular homes in land-leased communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and the loss of investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible to third reading."

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** Ballinger is kicking in his television set right now. Ballinger can't believe he lost to you. Billy is having a stroke right this minute.

**Mr O'Connor:** In spite of all the heckling from the opposite side, I support this legislation. In fact, those people don't want it to come forward.

#### LABOUR DISPUTE

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly and specifically to the Minister of Labour.

"Whereas in 1986 the present Minister of Labour, then the New Democratic Labour critic, and Premier Bob Rae, then the Leader of the Opposition, introduced a private member's bill to protect building cleaning workers; and

"Whereas the employees of Modern Building Cleaners, the contract cleaners for the Ontario Science Centre, have been on strike for the last two weeks; and

"Whereas the employees, all members of OPSEU, have filed a grievance with the Ontario Labour Relations Board alleging that management of the Ontario Science Centre have been performing the cleaning duties during the strike in direct violation of Bill 40; and

"Whereas the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation, the Honourable Anne Swarbrick, last Thursday evening crossed the picket line to attend a dinner with the trustees of the Ontario Science Centre; and

"Whereas the striking workers are holding a rally at the Ontario Science Centre today while the board meets to make a decision on whether or not to close the centre,

"We therefore petition the Minister of Labour, who only 10 years ago was the standard-bearer for building cleaning workers, to intervene to bring about a solution in this strike action and prevent the closing of one of Ontario's main tourist attractions."

I agree with this petition and I also have affixed my signature thereto.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** I have a petition that reads as follows:

"To Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearm safety course or examination."

I agree and have signed this petition.

#### DIETITIANS

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I have a petition prepared by Dana Barack and signed by hundreds of citizens of the province of Ontario, from Ottawa to

Toronto to London and elsewhere. It's addressed to the Legislative Assembly and says:

"We, the citizens of Ontario, Canada, petition the government of Ontario to reinstate stipends for dietetic interns, or to otherwise provide another form of assistance.

"Whereas this is a necessary, accredited practicum for the completion of a dietitian's education and membership in the Ontario College of Dietitians;

"Whereas this is a profession recognized for its contribution to health promotion and disease prevention, the basic determinants of health;

"Whereas we do not have any form of income during the internship and do not qualify for unemployment insurance, welfare or Ontario student assistance program funding;

"Whereas we are expected to begin full repayment of OSAP loans (both Canada and Ontario) immediately after university graduation...."

They petition to return the assistance and I sign my name on this petition.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound):** I have a petition from the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. This petition has been signed by many, many people in my riding, and it's to Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are extremely objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearm owners and hunters, and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearm safety course or examination."

I have also signed this.

#### MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I have a petition sent to me by Dr Berger in Uxbridge concerned about the periodic medical exams and all that review that was taking place. It reads:

"We, the undersigned, believe all Ontarians should be covered for preventive health and periodic screening procedures and money would not be saved by delisting preventive health exams."

They'll be happy to know that hasn't happened, as a result of that very public review. I've signed my name.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** I too have a petition, that is addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It's from the citizens against Bill 45. I'm not going to take up the time of the Legislature with reading through the whereases, but apparently the undersigned are petitioning the Legislature to stop this bill and any future bills of the same order.

Although I do not agree with all the content of the petition, on behalf of my constituents I'm submitting it to the Legislature and affixing my name as the submitter of the petition.

1530

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have a petition to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe there will be enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and may include sadomasochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all such references should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile homes by the action of their landlord;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

I'm speaking on behalf of the thousands of residents in my constituency who are absolutely appalled at the stalling tactics of both the Liberals and the Conservatives when it was in committee.

**Interjection:** Can I sign that petition?

**Mr Mills:** Yes, sign it. It's just awful.



## FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** I have a petition addressed to Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, from the Anglers and Hunters.

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously"—they've got "strenuously" highlighted—"objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and 'grandfathered' those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination, and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;"—a good point,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearm owners and hunters, and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearm safety course or examination."

I think that's a pretty straightforward and reasonable course of action. I'm going to sign this petition and submit it on behalf of the anglers and hunters of the great riding of York Centre.

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Ms Haeck from the standing committee on regulations and private bills presented the committee's report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill Pr78, An Act respecting the Township of Huron and the Village of Ripley.

Your committee begs to report the following bills as amended:

Bill Pr63, An Act respecting the Township of Glanbrook

Bill Pr89, An Act respecting the Town of Bothwell

Bill Pr91, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: Given the suspicion cast on the principal secretary of the government earlier today and with the reports that have been reported in the paper, I wonder if I might seek unanimous consent of the House to dissolve the Parliament and let the people have an opportunity to pass judgement on the government. Unanimous consent, Madam Speaker, for dissolution?

**The Acting Speaker:** Is it the wish of this House to agree to his motion? No.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance):** On a point of privilege, Madam Speaker:

I would have thought that by now the Liberals would have learned what happens to parties that call an election after three years.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR L'IMPOSITION DES CORPORATIONS

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I move that leave be given to introduce a bill entitled An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, and that it be now read for the very first time.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Mr Laughren moves that leave be given to introduce a bill entitled An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act and that it now be read a first time. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Carried. The Minister of Finance may address the bill.

**Hon Floyd Laughren:** And I think this perhaps would answer some of the queries coming from the opposition. If not, I would like to know.

I am pleased today to introduce the Corporations Tax Amendment Act, 1994. This bill replaces two earlier pieces of proposed legislation, Bill 133 and Bill 66, which received first reading only, and combines additional measures proposed in the 1993 budget.

You will recall that Bill 133 contained legislation to implement a corporate minimum tax as announced in the 1993 budget. Bill 66, the other bill this replaces, contained proposals made in the 1992 budget and included other changes to parallel amendments to the federal Income Tax Act.

This bill includes the proposal to reduce the portion of meals and entertainment expenses deductible for corporate income tax purposes from 80% to 50% and other measures to close corporate tax loopholes and improve tax fairness.

This bill includes a special additional tax on life insurance corporations announced in the 1992 budget designed to ensure that life insurance corporations assume their fair share of taxes. It also includes a revised definition of what constitutes an insurance company for the purposes of the insurance premium tax.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for your patience, and the members of the opposition for their interest.

## PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Madam Speaker, on a point of order: I just received the notes—they're quite lengthy, I might add—on this amalgamation of two previous pieces of legislation, plus new. I will say this: There seems to be some difficulty with the government officials and people—

**Interjection:** Get to the point.

**Mr Stockwell:** I am.

—in supplying information to the opposition parties, and I won't speak for the Liberals, but certainly the

Conservative caucus, with respect to explanatory notes and compendium notes when introducing pieces of legislation.

We've had this discussion before with respect to the Minister of Transportation. Now I will rise again and say that when the Treasurer stood to introduce this piece of legislation, he was seeking a vote on first reading. When he's seeking a vote on first reading, it's usually in the course of business that we in fact allow that vote to take place. It's a common courtesy that we give the government.

I will add this: We give them that common courtesy because previous to hearing what the minister says on the piece of legislation and understanding what is before the Legislature, we receive compendium notes or explanatory notes about what is being introduced. Once again, for a significant number of times, at least three or four times, we received the notes after the minister has introduced a piece of legislation and asked this Legislature to vote on it.

I would say once again, through you, Madam Speaker, to the government officials, the assistants and the workers who are supposed to bring these notes forward, that it's in the best interests of making sure this place works properly and having up-to-date and well-informed opposition benches that we know, when the minister stands to introduce a bill, what bill he is introducing.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** I appreciate your comments. That is up to the government to try to accommodate the opposition.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance):** No, it isn't. Madam Speaker, on a point of order, if I might, in view of the comments raised by the member for Etobicoke West, which I appreciate, and I understand his concern. However, I would remind the member for Etobicoke West that the purpose of introducing the bill for first reading is simply to do that: to put it in front of members so they can have an opportunity to read it before debate in substance starts, which is the second reading debate on principle.

I'm not sure why the member would object to us introducing a bill so he can have a look at it and think about it and consult with his colleagues before second reading debate occurs. That's the purpose of first reading introduction, so there's time to think about it before the second reading debate occurs.

1540

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I heard the comments from the Treasurer, and although I agreed with him up to a point, the point where I stopped agreeing with him was that in the standing orders it says—I can't find it at this very moment, but if you take the time to review the standing orders, they say very clearly that before a bill is introduced by a government minister, compendium notes or explanatory notes would be distributed to the opposition parties.

Now, that isn't just to have the critics figure out what is being introduced at the time. Sometimes, party politics being what they are, some opposition parties would vote against introduction on first reading. It's not unusual; it

has happened. It happened with government when they were on this side of the House on a number of occasions.

So I take great exception to the Treasurer's interpretation of the rules, and I take great exception to the fact that again, as has happened on a number of occasions, we didn't get the compendium notes, the explanatory notes, before the bill was introduced.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to review the standing orders on the compendium notes and when we're supposed to get them, whether it's not before first reading. If in fact I'm wrong, I certainly will stand corrected. If I am correct, would you please advise the ministers of the government to supply us with the notes.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Since the member opposite has raised this issue a number of times, it's time we got the issue clearly resolved in this House, both for the purpose of the House and for the purpose of the member for Etobicoke West.

The delivery of documents to the member opposite today and on all occasions he's arisen has been precisely the same as the delivery of documents to every opposition leader and opposition critic on introduction of every bill, because the standing orders call for the delivery of the compendium on the introduction. A member who is a minister of the crown stands in his place and begs leave to introduce, and when that introduction occurs is when the compendiums are delivered. That's the point at which the first reading vote happens.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** On the same point, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** I would like to finish. In the standing orders, 38(c) does say, "On the introduction of a government bill, a compendium of background information shall be delivered to the opposition critics." So you are correct, and it is on introduction of the bill, which would be today. I hope that clarifies.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: When we move to voting on the introduction of a bill at first reading, that is beyond the introduction of bills. There is a clear differentiation between introduction and voting on first reading. The House rules are very clear in this case: It shall be on introduction. No matter how the government may twist and turn this, you cannot vote on something if you are—

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. Could the member take his seat, please. I have ruled according to the standing orders.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### INTERIM SUPPLY

### CRÉDITS PROVISOIRES

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for interim supply for the period commencing April 1, 1994, and ending July 31, 1994.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** We are resuming the debate on interim supply. When we adjourned yesterday, the member for Etobicoke West had the floor, if he would like to continue.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Timely, very timely. Eight minutes left, and I want to cover maybe two



quick subjects, the last one very briefly.

I understand what the standing orders say. I just want to make the point that on the introduction of the bill, we're supposed to get the compendium notes. When they introduce the bill, we get the compendium notes before a vote is taken. That way—

**The Acting Speaker:** To the member, I would appreciate you dealing with the interim supply.

**Mr Stockwell:** I am. This is interim supply. It's a tax matter. We get the compendium notes on introduction of the bill, so before it goes to the first reading vote, we know what bill were voting on. The difficulty on opposition benches—which you may well find out; I don't know—is that when you just hear a couple of numbers, what bill number they are, you have no idea what bill you're debating or expected to vote upon.

Let me give you a quick example. Photo-radar was introduced. It was introduced by a bill number. We wanted to oppose photo-radar in the first reading. We did not receive the compendium notes—

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** Do you want them a half-hour before?

**Mr Stockwell:** No, we'd like before they ask us to vote on first reading. I don't think that's a lot to ask. Just get the compendium notes before you ask us to vote on first reading. There have been two or three pieces of legislation that we wanted to vote against on first reading. We couldn't vote against them because all the member did when introducing the bill was quote a bill number. We couldn't possibly know what that bill number incorporated, and therefore we couldn't vote against it.

Yesterday, the member for Oxford—I wish he were here—suggested to me during my speech about the deficit that in fact the numbers were contained in the budget of 1993 with respect to the deficit figures for the crown agencies and how much debt they would incur, that it was included in the budget book.

I want to make it very clear to the members opposite that the member for Oxford was absolutely wrong and I was absolutely right. If you go to page 93 of the budget book, you'll note that there is a deficit subtotal figure for non-budgetary items of some \$804 million. Included in that are education, colleges, universities, school boards and hospitals, where you transferred debt to those agencies to acquire on your behalf that you'd pay for. Below that were the crown corporations: environment and energy, Clean Water Agency, Ontario Realty Corp, Transportation Capital Corp.

In total, they are going to accrue \$804 million worth of debt. When you look at the carry-forward column on table C4—

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** Will that show up in the budget?

**Mr Stockwell:** That's exactly my point, I say to the member for St Catharines. I want to make it clear, because the member for Oxford gave the impression I was misleading the House, and I was not. When you take page 93 and look at the debt, the debt total comes in at, planned, \$3.096 billion capital. Underneath it is the \$804

million, so the gross total is \$3.9 billion including those non-budgetary items.

When you flip over to the deficit figures announced by the Treasurer, the deficit figures show capital expenditure to be \$3.096 billion. It doesn't include the \$804 million for education, where you ask them to build the schools and acquire the debt, it doesn't include colleges and universities or hospitals, where you ask them to acquire the debt on your behalf, and it doesn't include the crown corporations and the debt they're going to acquire over the next year.

In reality, the member for Oxford was saying that people know that new debt is on the books, but the Treasurer did not include that in his deficit forecast figures in his 1993 budget. It may seem a little picayune, but it's very important. It's nearly \$1 billion of debt that you didn't show in your books. It's nearly \$1 billion of debt that you didn't count in your 1993 budget book.

I take the member for Oxford to task. He is convinced that somehow this is included in your budget book. He's categorically incorrect. I've heard him say, not just in this place but in other places, that it's included, and I wish he'd stop. The proof is in the pudding. It's your Treasurer's budget book. It is not included in the deficit figure originally called for of \$9.159 billion. Some \$804 million was left off, and this money you're moving off-book to separate corporations and not including in your deficit figures.

Stop telling the public you are. That's all I'm suggesting. Stop telling the public that you're including these deficit figures, because you're not. Your original estimate was \$9.1 billion; it should have been \$10 billion. The reason it wasn't \$10 billion is because it was a magic figure the Treasurer didn't want to go over, so he took out \$800 million, moved it off-book and said he had a \$9.1-billion budget deficit.

1550

The other point of interest that I had was with the member for Downsview.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** No, Downsview, and I'm sorry he's not here. He was rather vocal yesterday on my numbers that I examined with respect to Jobs Ontario. So last night I went back to my office after hearing his complaints and I went through the budget and went through the numbers that you said you would create as far as jobs were concerned through Jobs Ontario.

In your 1992 budget book, when you announced Jobs Ontario, you called for 90,000 jobs to be created. You said 90,000 jobs. I reviewed the job figures that came forward from the minister yesterday, and this is two years down the road. In fact, you said you'd have 90,000 jobs created by the second year; you said you'd have 30,000 created in the first year. Today, there are 20,000 created and 10,000 waiting to be filled. Give the benefit of the doubt to the government: You filled 30,000 jobs. You're a full year behind your timetable. You're not even close to the 90,000 jobs that your ministry said it would create with Jobs Ontario.

It's very good sometimes to adjourn debate in the

House because it gives you an interesting opportunity to go back to the budget, back to the figures, and come back the next day and say categorically, without debate, the figures I quoted yesterday, the deficit numbers the member for Oxford was talking about, were right. He is thoroughly uninformed. The member for Downsview was uninformed with respect to his heckling of me with respect to 100,000 jobs that were supposed to be created.

I think it's a good opportunity for the people out there to realize that there's a spin put on everything by this government. Mr Piper used to put the spin on. He's now gone. I think it's Mr Weppler, is it, who—

**Mr Bradley:** Yes, Murray Weppler.

**Mr Stockwell:** Murray Weppler now puts the spin on all product that leaves this place, and what the problem is with spin is this: Sometimes the spin doctors cross the line and they cross the line between spinning and outright untruths. The point the member—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Outright untruths. I'm not saying he's lying; I'm just saying he's spun it so much that it loses its tap to reality. The member for Oxford and the member for Downsview have bought into these so much so in some instances that they don't look at the figures, they don't read the book and they don't understand that just by flipping through this you know that the spin has been spun so much it's absolutely incorrect.

I wanted to get those two on the record. "Absolutely incorrect" I don't think is unparliamentary. I want to get those kind of things on the record because I was challenged yesterday by the two members with the statistics and the analysis that I did with respect to the deficit numbers and Jobs Ontario and I can come forward in good conscience today and say the numbers that I gave yesterday were absolutely accurate.

The numbers I gave yesterday were the numbers that your government used, the numbers I gave yesterday were the numbers that you approved in your budget that I quoted back to you some year or two years later. The only difficulty this government has is how inaccurate its prognosis for growth in Jobs Ontario and how inaccurate its prognosis for the deficit was.

I thank you for the time, Madam Speaker. I look forward to questions and comments.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. Now we have time for questions or comments to the member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** I'd just like to comment in regard to the question of spin that the honourable member talks about. I think when it comes to the question of spins, the Conservative Party of Ontario, like the Liberal Party of Ontario, doesn't have a monopoly or a virtue on that particular issue. I think all political parties look at issues from their basic ideology. I grant you the Conservative Party has a particular ideology that it feels is right and it advocates for it. For that, I give them credit because that's what this House is all about. Every political party looks at issues from their particular perspective.

As for the question of off-book financing, I would say

to the member—and I think he's alluded to that and actually he said that in his remarks yesterday—not every government, but a number of governments within the country of Canada look at off-book financing when it comes to capital by way of doing their accounting and by way of doing their business. I think they recognize that.

To the member for Etobicoke West, I've got to say, at least in his debate he's being somewhat fairminded in being able to point that out, but I just want to say to the member, to you as a Conservative member looking at this, you want to be able to put your spin on it. I understand that and I respect that, because that's what your job is. You're here to represent the members you're supposed to represent in your riding and those people who are affiliated to your party with your particular ideology.

But to pretend that all of sudden Murray Weppler or Mr Piper before is the only one or the only ones who have any intention of being able to put spin on anything I think is just stretching it a wee bit. I think, in all fairness, you put your spin on things according to the way that you see it.

What the Treasurer has done is basically followed the practice of a number of provinces across the country of Canada when it comes to off-book financing. We're not the first ones to do this, and I think the member has already recognized that in his speech.

I want to say, just in wrapping up, I always enjoy listening to the member for Etobicoke West. I find his comments to be most entertaining and I look forward to hearing yet again on some other interim supply the comments from the member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Bradley:** I found particularly interesting the explanation the member for Etobicoke West offered on the manipulation of various crown corporations. This is nothing new. Members of this House who have followed politics for a number of years would know that the Social Credit in British Columbia, under the man who was known affectionately as Wacky Bennett, W.A.C. Bennett, used to do the same thing.

In order to make the deficit look lower, they simply established crown corporations and then assigned the debt, as the member has appropriately pointed out, to those crown corporations. Then the Treasurer of the day, now called the Minister of Finance, could wave the budget book and say that the deficit was either non-existent or much less than they had anticipated.

I'm pleased that the member for Etobicoke West has pointed that out to those who might be watching this program, because what happens is, on the day when the budget is announced, people tend to zero in on simply the headlines or what the government presents, and I hope that everybody knows what the government will be up to: taking, for instance, the water and sewer grants and operations out and putting them in the so-called clean water corporation. That is simply moving that debt off the government debt and putting it on some crown corporation's debt load.

I think they will not fool the rating agencies in New York and in Canada and other places that look at what the real debt is. If they were up front and said, "Here is



what the deficit will be. We're going to try to deal with it appropriately," there wouldn't be the same problem as if they try to hide the debt in various places, fooling no one and simply not addressing the problems that confront the province, as the member has mentioned appropriately.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I rise to make just a few brief comments on the discourse from my colleague the member for Etobicoke West. He has pointed out, as have many people in our party, the absolute deceit of the numbers which the government has been bringing forward. Yesterday in debate there was, as the member has pointed out, a lot of heckling across the floor from the members from the NDP disputing what he was saying.

The fact is, the numbers are very plain in the government's own documents. We have repeatedly pointed out that, according to the budget documents from last year, the government was taking off book \$600 million of debt which it was going to have the school boards raise, because they recognized that the government didn't have any more borrowing capacity. They were just simply saying to the school boards, "Okay, we will have you borrow the money and then we'll let you debt-service it." That was \$600 million that otherwise would have been on the books, but if you read the budget, it is very plain what they did.

Also, they created the capital corporations, which took \$804 million off the books, and the \$804 million was verging on fraud. The Provincial Auditor pointed this out. This is the first time in history that a Provincial Auditor has refused to sign the books, and it was quite simply because the government was playing fast and loose with numbers.

The capital corporations had the infusion of money from the government to buy the properties and then they promptly gave the money back, which is a very unusual transaction, because it was funny money. It was just as good as Monopoly money. The sale really hadn't been consummated. If a corporation transferred to its subsidiary on that basis, they would have taken a paper back.

1600

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. The member's time has expired. We have time for one more question or comment from any other member. The member for Etobicoke West has two minutes to reply.

**Mr Stockwell:** I thank the members who participated in the questions and comments. I think it's fairly clear now, and accepted by probably all parties about, that the brinkmanship kind of financing that's taking place is not healthy for an economy in a state such as Ontario's, and pretty much everybody, including the bond-rating agencies and those people in the know, have understood what has happened.

I just want to take time to comment with respect to the spin business. You see, I don't think you can argue with a government or an opposition party putting a spin on a particular issue, because we all think differently; there's just no two ways about it. We come at an issue differently than the government and the Liberals come at it differently than we do, and I understand that.

I guess the problem I'm having is that I don't think there should be any spin involved with respect to the finances of the province of Ontario. I think we should standardize accounting practices. They should be reported exactly the same, not mattering which government's in power or which politician's in charge of the treasury. I think there should be standard accounting practices, like in business. If you don't follow the standard accounting practices in business, you can literally be thrown in jail. You can be charged and thrown in jail if you're on the trading floor and you're not in fact following standard accounting practices, and no accountant would sign off on them.

If there is anything I would ask this government to do and ask any government in the future to do, it's to standardize the accounting practices of every government so that when they report their books out, you don't have to ferret through and dig up these examples of trickery.

They're nothing more than trickery, because they don't fool the people for long, at least the people in the know. You get caught. And you know what? You never fool the bond agencies, because they've got people ferreted away in offices down in the basement figuring out what government is trying to trick us.

Every time they find it, they get a little bit excited because they've found another government who's tried to pull the wool over their eyes, and you get downgraded anyway. They're going to try it again, mark my words. Prepare for the downgrading when your next budget gets announced.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate on the interim supply bill? The member for St Catharines.

**Mr Bradley:** I hope in my 30 minutes I will have for the purpose of delivering this speech this afternoon that I will be able to touch on a number of areas, both of local interest and of province-wide interest.

The first I wish to deal with is that of the secret document that was leaked today and discussed in this House by Mr Conway, the member for Renfrew North, who I think appropriately pointed out that it indicates that the government is now clearly in an election mode and isn't about to do much in the way of governing and working any more.

If you look at the fact that there's going to be a significant reduction in the number of cabinet meetings, then you recognize that the ministers are going to be out spinning their particular slant on all of the issues, trying to extol the virtues of the government.

While this is one of the responsibilities that they have of promoting what the government is doing, my concern is that as they reduce the number of meetings, problems will arise. They will find out that some issues will not be addressed in an appropriate fashion, that many more mistakes will be made when the members of cabinet and various committees are not there to analyse the decisions as they should.

In this secret document it says, "The focusing decisions make it feasible to reduce the number of cabinet committee meetings." It also says: "A critical challenge will be managing expectations relating to initiatives which we

will be unable to pursue. To this purpose, each minister and deputy minister will meet soon with representatives of the Premier's office and Cabinet Office to discuss how best to manage these issues. We will also be developing a communications strategy for the exercise as a whole."

What this tells me is that in fact the government, led in this case on the civil service side by the former campaign manager, and I would suggest present campaign manager, of Premier Bob Rae, will be attempting to manage the news, will be attempting to put the appropriate slant on the reasons why the government is not proceeding with matters that it indicated were of some importance in months and years gone by.

I have expressed in this House before my concern about this government putting socialist operatives into key positions. I'd be concerned whether it were people of any particular strong partisan slant. I don't know if the member for Durham Centre is aware of this, but out west what has happened is that when an NDP government is defeated, because it has put clearly partisan people in key civil service positions, the new government coming in ends up removing almost all of those people and then they head to the place where there's another NDP government. This has happened in Saskatchewan and in Manitoba and in British Columbia.

What is much better has been the tradition in Ontario. We had Bud Tangney this afternoon in the House being honoured. In my view, he exemplifies a totally non-partisan civil service.

When the Liberal government came to office, I was suspicious, as some might be, because when you're in opposition you don't necessarily understand the workings of the civil service, that these people must be Progressive Conservatives, since they had served under a Conservative government for 42 years.

I in fact found that for the largest part the people were non-partisan; they were professional people who had moved up through the ranks or come in from the private sector and joined the civil service, the public service, and had served the previous government well and were serving the next government well.

What I see now are key positions being filled by those who have a socialist background and socialist slant. I would be equally concerned were it another political party constantly filling these positions. I understand in some cases this does happen, and I'm not being critical in certain circumstances.

I think it was particularly unwise of the Premier to choose David Agnew, his campaign manager, a clear NDP partisan, for the position of secretary to cabinet, because that position, while it works carefully with the cabinet, is a position which in my view should not be given to the campaign manager of the New Democratic Party, because this is what we see, this document which indicates clearly what is going to happen in terms of the government's future. This is not a cabinet document in essence; it is a political document, and clearly a political document.

It talks about category B items, which are obviously going to be dropped down in terms of the importance to

the government, and it states, "These items will usually have second priority on the agenda for the remainder of the term." A lot of people who are supportive of the government probably thought a lot of these issues were going to be brought to the forefront by this government.

Category E is the most interesting. It says many items will require changed work plans. This will involve "(i) substantially reducing work; (ii) stopping all work; and (iii) withdrawing most or all resources devoted to these items." It will be most interesting to see what those items happen to be.

The meeting time for cabinet committees will be reduced as follows:

"(a) cabinet continue to meet weekly"—and this is what's important—"but with increased time made available for strategic planning and communications issues." That means "for politics" in case anybody didn't know.

"(b) policy and priorities board reduce its meeting schedule by one meeting per month with at least one of the remaining three weekly meetings being devoted to strategic planning and communications issues, recognizing that additional meeting time will be required to finalize estimates and budget-related issues.

"(c) treasury board, Management Board and the jobs committee to meet biweekly, except that treasury board will meet more often for estimates review."

Clearly, where there is a straight partisan agenda, there will be a considerable number of meetings and where there is a government, a management agenda, there will be a great reduction.

It says, "To provide closure, Cabinet Office" will "be directed to prepare a report, potentially for public use, summarizing the implementation of the status of previous categories." It mentions what the government is all about in this.

I think this was a most revealing document. What is quite shocking, as a matter of fact, is how it ever got out. I hope that the Premier, who has sicked the—or at least he would say he has not—but has allowed the OPP or allowed his government to direct the OPP to investigate the opposition when they get hold of these documents and the civil service and members of the news media, does not allow this to happen again, even though this is a serious breach in terms of the security of government documents.

It's obviously somebody who is genuinely concerned about the agenda of the government and the mode of action of the government who has felt strongly enough to make this available to one of the news outlets.

1610

Also, I would like to deal a bit with some of the tactics that I see being employed by the Premier of this province. A lot of us who watched Bob Rae—and I use that name rather than Premier Rae because of when he was in opposition—in the federal House when he used to have those glib little comments, those quick turns of phrase that used to get him on television. We well remember the criticism he used to level legitimately at governments for various of the tactics that he employs today. We remember well that he was seen or at least featured himself as



a national figure with a national commitment.

All we have seen—it's quite obvious—is that the Premier does not intend to run on his record. Were I a Premier with the record this government has, I might be inclined not to run on that record either. But what he has engaged in, quite obviously, and will engage in from now till the election, is blaming everybody else but his own government for the problems that confront this province.

You have seen on a number of occasions that in a humorous fashion I have held up numbers for members of the House. They represent essentially the basic answers the Premier will give. My colleague the member for Scarborough-Agincourt presented a suggestion on what some of these mean. The first four deal with the federal government and how it must somehow be the federal government's fault. I have added a fifth and a sixth. The fifth is that it must be the previous government's fault and the sixth is that it must be the opposition parties' fault.

I think that if the Premier would look in the mirror, he would find the number one problem and the number one reason for the problems that this province confronts. I think that people are sick and tired of politicians at one level of government blaming another level of government. I say this even in terms of watching municipalities blaming the provincial government. They have some legitimacy in doing so, because this provincial government has done to the municipalities, to the local agencies, to local people, what it accuses the federal government of doing, and all with a straight face. But when those municipalities and other agencies have complained, they have not received the same kind of sympathetic hearing they might have in years gone by. I think the reason for that is that people now see through this idea of blaming somebody else all of the time.

Indeed, there are times when another level of government has a greater responsibility. But I think the Premier can wear that out rather quickly. The people I talked to out there are really not fooled by that. Instead, they're looking for the Premier, with the resources that he has, dealing with the issues that he has as well as he possibly can.

Something else I notice is unusual for an NDP Premier. It really is, when you get down to about 6% in the by-elections, as the government has been in the last couple of by-elections, what happens in desperation. I never thought I'd see the day that Bob Rae would engage in, for political purposes, Quebec-bashing. It's good politics. Don't get me wrong; that is very good politics. But somehow I could never envisage Stephen Lewis—who used to stand in the House not far from where I am, being critical of the Davis government when it used to engage in that kind of federal-provincial relations, shall we call it—doing that.

I was quite surprised to see that a person who features himself as a nation-builder—and he was lecturing others on nation-building the other day—would in fact engage as bluntly and clearly as he has in the good old politics of Quebec-bashing. I don't want for a moment to say it isn't effective politics; I just want to say that it's unusual for the New Democratic Party, which has stood for

different things over the years, to engage in that. I suspect if the Premier were at 40% or 50% in the polls, you wouldn't see that happen.

I also want to say that we've seen a new tactic develop with this government. It's not really new; I saw Larry Grossman try it in 1983. That was that whenever there's an announcement coming up with the government, you'll notice that the word goes out, "I'm going to kick you in the face." I use that as an analogy rather than actual wording. In other words, the word is out that it's going to be a tough economic message. Then, when the government doesn't kick the transfer agency in the face but instead kicks it in the shins, everybody is supposed to applaud and say, "Thank goodness, the government gave us nothing," because they thought it was going to take something away.

It's an effective tactic with some. But, again, I think members of the news media have seen through this, and others are seeing through this particular tactic. I certainly will never allow this government to get away with lowering the expectations only to come through at the last minute and gather the praise.

I want to touch briefly as well on the effectiveness of, and my support for, infrastructure renewal. There are those out there who are critical of infrastructure renewal as a job creation tactic. I think it's very positive for two basic reasons. The first is that it is an investment in jobs that are good jobs. They are effective jobs, they are jobs that people can look at and say, "Yes, they have to be done." It creates employment with its spinoff effects. The second part of it is that there is a tangible result at the end. For instance, there is a new sewage treatment plant built for increased capacity so that when businesses want to come to invest or people want to expand, all of the infrastructure is there. It makes Ontario a much more attractive place to invest.

I know there are people who are critical of it. I remember seeing a television commercial where they had people who work in construction shovelling things from one hole to another. I think that misrepresented what infrastructure renewal is about. I noted with glee that the province that received by far the most infrastructure dollars from the federal government was in fact the province of Ontario. I'm delighted to see that. I'm glad because I saw that in the last budget the capital spending, that is, largely construction spending of this government, of the Rae government, was cut by \$300 million. Of course, that will be restored now as the federal government comes to the rescue with its money.

The municipalities are participating. That does cost them some money as well, but I see that as an investment in the immediate future with jobs and in the medium- and long-term future with the roads that are built, the bridges that are constructed, the various things that are done in communities to improve them. I hope that has a positive effect, and I think it will, on our economy.

I dealt in this House previously with the issue of student welfare, and it's an issue which has been there for a while. Let me just explain very briefly for members of the House the program that was there.

The student welfare program was one which was

designed to assist those students who were genuinely abused and came from a totally intolerable situation at home. Those people, in order to keep them in school productively—these were kids, usually 16 and 17—were provided with a student welfare grant, with some funding, with some assistance. What has happened—and certainly the regional municipality of Niagara is aware of this—is that it has become abused. The problem with this is that we are liable to lose the whole program, because there will be those who say: “Let’s throw the whole thing out. It’s obviously being abused. We don’t need it. Let’s get rid of it.”

I don’t think that’s the best tactic to take. I think what you have to do is to bring it back to its original purpose, for students from homes which are terrible circumstances, where there may be abuse of various kinds that is accepted by independent people and everyone is knowledgeable that this is the case, and those students agree to keep a commitment to go to school. That’s the condition under which it should be used, not under other conditions.

One problem is that many of those students are not attending school. The second is that some of those young people are using it as a lever against their parents and almost get to the point, in some circumstances, where they say, “I’m leaving home and I’m going to live in the streets,” to the horror perhaps of the parents, and try to encourage their parents to sign a paper that says there are irreconcilable differences between the two.

1620

I got a letter from Regional Councillor Tim Kenny. Tim Kenny is a secondary school teacher, an individual very concerned with young people. It reads as follows:

“On February 17, 1994, I moved the attached motion respecting students in receipt of GWA at the council of the regional municipality of Niagara. The motion, which carried unanimously, requested the Minister of Community and Social Services to set attendance and/or grade standards which students must attain in order to be eligible for general welfare assistance.

“As a high school teacher, I was astounded to learn there were no such standards contained in the GWA legislation. It is my belief that such standards would provide GWA case workers and school administrators the leverage they need when dealing with chronically absent students who are in receipt of GWA.

“In addition, these standards would clearly define the responsibilities of the student.

“It is my hope that you will pursue this matter on behalf of the regional municipality of Niagara. Should you need any additional information please feel free to contact me.”

It’s signed by Tim Kenny, regional councillor and teacher.

The resolution reads as follows. It’s not, again, a resolution which calls for the abolishing of the program, but simply a bringing back to its original narrow, appropriate focus.

“Whereas under general welfare assistance regulations, individuals who qualify for general welfare assistance

may continue to be eligible while attending educational programs such as secondary school;

“Whereas general welfare assistance provides needed assistance for youths who have experience involving dysfunctional families, mental, physical and sexual abuse;

“Whereas some eligible students register as full-time students but fail to attend classes on a regular basis;

“Whereas the Ministry of Community and Social Services does not set attendance standards;

“Therefore be it now resolved that the regional municipality requests the Ministry of Community and Social Services to set attendance and/or grade standards which students must attain in order to be eligible for general welfare assistance.”

I think it’s a reasonable resolution. It deals with part of the problem that I have brought to the attention of the minister, the second part being the terrible agony faced by parents who have yet another sledgehammer that can be used against them in attempting to bring about rules and regulations in the house. In other words, where discipline is exercised, where rules are set down for someone residing in a house, a student has that opportunity to use this against the parents as leverage to get easier discipline at home, easier regulation at home, and also has the opportunity to leave.

This is subject to a lot of abuse. If the program is going to continue to exist, it’s going to be exceedingly important that that abuse be removed as quickly as possible, and the minister has given that undertaking to me in the question that I asked in the House.

I want to deal as well in a parochial sense, because interim supply allows me to do so, with the matter of funding of universities. Brock University in St Catharines does not receive what I consider to be appropriate funding under the formula that is applied for universities in this province. In fact, it receives at the present time about 93%, or 93 cents on the dollar, of what it might expect to receive under a fair funding formula, while other universities receive perhaps 106 or 107 cents on the dollar.

I would hope that the minister of education, colleges and universities would look into this matter and would resolve it to the satisfaction of Brock. The people at Brock University—the students, the administration, the faculty, the parents of those who attend Brock—are not looking for something more than others have, but simply a fair application of a formula which will give them 100% of that to which they are entitled, and I certainly am supportive of that.

I want to deal as well with the issue of gambling. I hate to dwell on this in every speech, but I am very, very concerned with the route that this government is taking in terms of gambling.

I notice that when Pierre Berton came to Niagara, he had some interesting things to say. Pierre Berton, as I recall, has been a strong supporter of the New Democratic Party over the years. Let me read to you what he said about gambling.

I’ll do that after I note that “Ontario to Expand Options for Sports Gambling.” They’re going to allow



Pro Line betting on World Cup soccer matches this June. I guess if you've got Pro Line, you'd allow that to happen, but allowing the Ontario Racing Commission to add another 300 off-track betting teletheatres to the 75 already operating in bars and restaurants in the province, what does that do? That allows people to spend more money on gambling. As a government in this province, we keep allowing more opportunities for people to spend their money on gambling rather than on consumer goods or services that may be of direct benefit to people.

Who are largely the people who gamble? They're those people who want to take a chance to get ahead. They're often people who are lower-income people, who are desperate to make their way in life, to make a better financial life for themselves, and get involved in gambling.

What is appalling to me and discouraging and disappointing is that it's the New Democratic Party which is expanding all of these gambling activities.

I got a letter from a friend of mine who is a New Democratic Party supporter—I think still; I'm not quite certain—who wrote to me at Christmastime. I won't reveal the person because I don't want to embarrass him, but he wrote to me and said: "I saw your speech on gambling in the Legislature. The problem is, a New Democrat should have made it."

That's what I'm thinking about the NDP caucus. There must be a lot of people in there who remember what over the years the New Democratic Party stood for in terms of gambling, in terms of a tax on lower-income people, in terms of a tax, voluntary as it might be, on vulnerable people.

I've come to the conclusion that governments, not only this government but some other governments, have come to the conclusion that they can't levy new taxes because no one will accept them, so the only tax they're prepared to embark upon is the so-called voluntary tax of gambling.

Here's what Pierre Berton had to say:

"Niagara's efforts to promote itself as a world-class tourist attraction will be jeopardized if Niagara Falls manages to land one of Ontario's first casinos, a noted Canadian historian says.

"Warning history is destined to repeat itself, writer and broadcaster Pierre Berton told Niagara business and political leaders yesterday that legalized gambling will scuttle Niagara Falls' long-time struggle to overcome its reputation as a second-rate tourist designation."

I've never agreed with that particular observation, but Pierre Berton says that when you want to enhance a reputation, you won't do so with a casino. He goes on to say:

"If I were you, I would resist with every atom of your being a casino in Niagara Falls."

"Berton warned casinos will bring few economic benefits and many social ills, including organized crime.

"Ask the police what they think of it," he said later. "They'll tell you they have to double the police force because of the prostitution and the thievery that goes on in a casino area."

"Once legalized casino gambling gets a foothold in Niagara, the industry will mushroom just like the lottery business has, he predicted.

"I think they produce a something-for-nothing attitude, which is the worst kind of education you can give the future," he said."

I agree with Pierre Berton in that regard. It does give a bad education to people, and it is moving entirely in the wrong direction. I hope this government will not continue to expand gambling opportunities in this province.

I want to touch very briefly on Hydro, because time is running out. I'm very annoyed, I have to say, as are many of my constituents, with this self-serving advertising of "the new Ontario Hydro." I would prefer them to spend the money on making it more efficient rather than in promoting itself to the people of this province. It reminds me of the old Tory days when the Ministry of Energy used to say: "Life is Good, Ontario. Preserve it. Conserve it." They always denied there was anything political about it, but it was of course to make you feel good about it.

I think we need to do this, and it is nothing radical and it's nothing anybody outside of this place cares about much. I think we should re-establish the select committee on Hydro affairs so that elected members can monitor Hydro on an ongoing basis. Some of the best committee work I've seen done was done in the select committee on Hydro affairs. It held it to account, to a certain extent; it made members knowledgeable of energy affairs in this province. I'd like to see that return.

1630

I want to touch on the question of tuition. It seems today that a lot of people are prepared to simply abandon the students out there. The government knows—it obviously is doing all this polling, even though they were all opposed to polls before, and they found out that people aren't going to become overly angry about tuition increases. But again that's a pretty vulnerable group.

If the economy were booming, if there were lots of jobs in Ontario, if the summer job situation were bright, as it was when many of us who sit in the House today went out into the world of work as students, one could say students are able to earn those funds. But with jobs scarce and with even the government announcing it is reducing the amount it's going to pay students for working in the summer, it's an increasing burden on those students. I think it's going to lead to restrictions on the number of people who can go to university. I am very concerned about that. I was somewhat annoyed when I listened to my favourite network, where one person was saying: "I listened to Bob Rae in that caucus room, and boy, was he prepared for the students. When they asked him about tuition increases, he said, 'Don't you realize we're just taking you back to what it was in the 1960s?'"

Well, indeed. I thought the man with sideburns and the thick glasses and the radical words of the 1960s was there to fight that kind of system. Today, he's extolling the virtues of it. I'm surprised by that, but even more surprised that the commentator would be taken in by that particular answer by the Premier of the province.

I hope the government will reconsider. I hope we will not punish the students. Everybody recognizes that they have to pay a share, but the tremendous increases, over 20% over the next two years, and the increases we have seen point to the fact that this government is not prepared to go to the defence of those it used to talk about with a good deal of enthusiasm when it talked about abolishing tuition at colleges and universities.

I regret that the amount of time available has expired under the new rules that Bob Rae has established in this House, and for that reason I will have to await the comments and questions of members.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Comments and/or questions?

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** When the Liberals were putting through their interim supply, we had a few problems in those days, and the honourable member who just finished speaking wasn't very happy when we'd start asking about the 33 tax increases and the way this government expanded and enlarged itself. I wouldn't mind if, in defence of the Liberal regime of David Peterson, the honourable member would take a few moments to tell us how he can defend his 33 tax increases against the 32 tax increases. I guess you didn't have time to get to it, Jimmy.

The thing is, the people of Ontario still haven't forgotten the legacy of the Peterson years. During that period, you saw a government, in one of the biggest booms Ontario has ever seen, spending the money with great abandon: allowing the bureaucracy to increase in size; suggesting that we move offices out of Toronto to different parts across the province; all kinds of efforts to make junior kindergarten mandatory in schools; adding extra costs to municipalities on the regulation of the court systems. As that government went ahead, it just thought there was no limit to the amount of money.

Then when they left office, they said, "Oh, there's a surplus here." I wouldn't mind if you'd comment on the wonderful surplus your government described, some \$23 million, that turned out to be a \$2-billion deficit. When you come to the mathematics of government, I know the honourable member would enjoy recounting how he justifies the misappropriation of public funds during their years in office. The people of Ontario still haven't forgotten, and I just thought I would take this happy moment to ask you why you didn't include some of those thoughts in your recent speech.

**Mr David Winner (London South):** The member for St Catharines addressed many different subjects during the course of his remarks today, but I really have to take issue in my response to some of the remarks he made about tuition and access to post-secondary education.

We know for a fact that the province of Ontario has the highest level of access to post-secondary education of any province in the country. The problem right now, however, is this: With more and more people unemployed, looking for new jobs and seeking training and further education, it's paramount that we have spaces available at our post-secondary facilities, be they community colleges or universities, to accommodate this

thirst for retraining and education.

One way to do that is to ensure that the level of tuition is at a level comparable to many other provinces. Many learned studies have shown that the student should contribute approximately 25% of the cost of education. This has been the case in the Maritimes, for example; it will now be the case here.

The Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance, which includes the University of Western Ontario in my area of London, called for annual increases of 10% over this and the next two years, to ensure that we can protect the quality of our educational programs and also to ensure access.

David Stager, an economist of note at the University of Toronto, did a rather conclusive study on the subject of tuition and access to education. He found, to cite Australia as an example, that increases in tuition bore absolutely no relationship to access to education.

In conclusion, experience and academic studies have shown quite the converse of the argument that the member for St Catharines put forward with respect to tuition.

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I want to congratulate the member for St Catharines, who always speaks so well on any topic, but I think particularly on money matters. He certainly did mention a number of things we are very concerned about with this government.

It seems we have proof that the election buses are being revved up by this government. I'm really concerned, as we all are over here, about the legacy this government will leave for the future group to take over. It really doesn't appear that deficits right now are uppermost in their minds.

One thing I know the member for St Catharines is always very concerned about, and I am as well, because we were privileged to be teachers at one time in our careers, is the incredible continuing deferral of payments to the teachers' pension fund. This taking a three-and-a-half-year holiday from making any payments against the \$8-billion unfunded liability is something we should be very concerned about.

I remember that when our government attempted to make sure the unfunded liability in the teachers' pensions was addressed, we had incredible opposition from the teachers' group. Now I have to wonder just what is going to happen at the end of three and a half years, when a government has to all of a sudden come up with payments. Of course, they are going to be incredible lump sums. This is very, very worrisome, and the member for St Catharines is always concerned about this, as many of us are.

**The Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? If not, the honourable member for St Catharines has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Bradley:** From 1981 to 1984, Mike Harris supported the Conservative government in 16 tax increases totalling \$1.823 billion. I've sat in this House since 1977 and I've seen Tory governments raise taxes, particularly regressive taxes, on people constantly. But I didn't get into that, because I think we have to look to



the future of this province. I don't think we can dwell on partisan bickering. I can list all kinds of Tory taxes.

I know we're the enemy now. The Liberal Party is the enemy because we happen to be ahead in the polls. I think we'd all be wise to dwell on what's going to happen in the future, what we are going to do about the future, not fighting the old battles of the past.

1640

I've got plenty of ammunition. I remember when Premier Davis was going to buy a jet. It was going to cost in excess of \$10 million. It was for the comfort and convenience of members of the cabinet and senior government officials. I had to get up virtually every day and ask him about the jet until he finally withdrew that. I understand those old days, but they're in the past and you don't hear me talk about that much any more.

In relation to the comments of the member for London South, all I'm saying is I find it appalling that anybody from the New Democratic Party, which advocated the abolition of tuition for students at colleges and universities, would get up and somehow defend these very significant increases in costs to students, because they used to stand for access, they used to stand for the little person. I suspect many members of the government are uneasy about that.

Lastly, I'd like to commend the member for Northumberland, Mrs Fawcett, for bringing up the issue of pension funds. I wish I had time to address that because, when I look out at young people in this province, I wonder where the money is going to come from to pay for their pensions, as this government continues to rob the pension plans of this province in order to make the books look good at this time.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate? The member for Markham.

**Mr Cousens:** When we look at what this government has done, we have to look at the failure of this government to look after the responsibilities of the finances of the province in a good way. Anything you have touched as a government has in some way lost its shine and lustre.

I'd like to talk for a moment about one of the issues that may have dropped off the front pages of the newspapers but it sure isn't off the front pages in York, Durham and Peel. It has to be this government's singleminded decision to build three megadumps in the urban shadow of Metro Toronto.

When you think of the process that was started by the Honourable Ruth Grier, who brought into the government in October 1991 Bill 143—Bill 143 at that time gave the government the authority to establish the Interim Waste Authority, which would become the agency of the government to establish three huge megadumps. They identified 57 sites and then they went through an artificial process of looking at those sites.

They caused communities in York, Durham and Peel unbelievable anxiety by virtue of selecting sites that were in the Rouge Valley, in the Oak Ridges moraine—prime agricultural farm land, sites that are on the headwaters of the Don and the Rouge, sites that have archaeological

value beyond belief. This government began that process. As they began that process they began to spend money and began that whole ideological war with the rest of the province as they said, "We are going to have dumps in the urban shadow of Toronto."

They made an ideological or political decision that prevented consideration of other methods of getting rid of waste. They became lords and masters of all wisdom based on the political ideology of their members, and that was to discard the whole thought of the possibility of energy from waste or incineration; to disregard the possibility of transporting waste to other sites where there may be willing hosts.

No, the only option open by this government was going to be through the Interim Waste Authority's review of possible sites. Then, as they got down to the short list, you saw finalists. Aren't they lucky people? In York, Durham and Peel you had three major sites in each area that were considered.

Meanwhile, the clock was ticking. Meanwhile, money was being spent. Now we're down at the final stage where the government has selected its final choice in Caledon, over in Peel, one in York region—and the one in York region will serve all of Metropolitan Toronto and it's located right at the border of the city of Vaughan and on King township—and then one over in Whitevale: three sites, huge megadumps.

How much do you think it has cost to carry out this terrible process of governing that this government has followed with the Interim Waste Authority and through Bill 143? Have you any idea? It's in excess of \$50 million already spent on this process, \$50 million wasted, thrown away because the government has failed to look at other options.

They have failed to look at the possibility of rail-haul. Mind you, they can live with garbage being shipped to Ohio or to Detroit, where it may be incinerated, or other options, but within Ontario this is an unrealistic, unfair approach to dealing with it.

The communities are incensed. I share in their anger, because if there is anything that will lose every seat for every New Democrat in York, Durham and Peel, it's going to be the garbage question, because if anything identifies this party as being a failure, as being a group that has misappropriated government funds to pursue ideological warfare against the people of those areas, it is this government.

If it's any government that has come along before it was elected and said, "We will open this up to a full environmental assessment"—Mr Rae, who was then Leader of the Opposition made those promises and assurances in Whitevale, at York, at the Keele Valley site, and he made them at Britannia and Peel. There are witnesses to it. When he was elected, he backed away and has pursued this wrong agenda to build megadumps in these communities, and has done so at the cost of \$50 million.

That's part of what we're talking about today, the interim supply and the government paying salaries for people to do what the government wants them to do.

What a horrible waste of money. What's it going to cost before it's finished? The estimates of the expropriation of the land will be in excess of \$65 million more.

It's over \$5 million in Peel, another \$29 million in Durham and another \$30 million or so in York, at least by now \$115 million spent on a wasted exercise, because when a new government takes over, I can assure the people of Ontario, there will be a new approach to dealing with this. Certainly the Liberals have already committed to backtracking on what the government has done, and our party has as well.

There is pain, the hurt, the anguish of the thousands of people in these communities who continue to fight. Today I just received the latest edition—I mean, here's a community fighting for its life—of The Impact Zone, citizens opposing the proposed King-Vaughan landfill. They carry on the battle, a lonely battle as they come along. They can do cartoons that show rats welcoming people to King City, but it's just a horrible thought of what's going on within our communities.

The people of our communities will not forgive Mr Rae, Ms Grier, Mr Wildman and the New Democrats for their failure to understand our communities. If the Toronto Star is accurate in forecasting that this government is beginning to get ready for an election, then it's not too late to stop spending and wasting government money, our tax dollars, on a process that is flawed and that is wrong, that is going to lead nowhere. Those dumps will never be built. What you're doing is just throwing away the money of the taxpayers of Ontario.

I say, as a constituency issue, that the people of my community in Markham were angry then when we were fighting for our community, to prevent those sites from being selected in Markham. We continue to fight with the people of York, Durham and Peel who continue that lonely battle to fight the Bob Rae government.

On constituency issues, I have one today. I can't mention the name of my constituent, but a very fine gentleman who is in early 50s was in my office today. He lost his job back in, I guess, May 1993. Within the time frame that's allocated, he went to the offices of the province of Ontario on Bloor Street and entered in his application for the Transitions program. He saw himself as one who really met the criteria for Transitions. He's a resident, a citizen of Ontario, he's older than 45, he's been laid off in the last six months, he's out of work. So now he's saying, "What can I do to get some help?"

1650

The Transitions program says there's a \$5,000 training credit to people who apply. So this constituent of mine applied and has applied and has applied. He applied for the funding and has not had a response; he hasn't had acceptance. Instead, he's gone ahead and he's applied for programs at George Brown, he's had high costs in what's going into it; still no response from the Transitions program, which has been moved from the Ministry of Labour over to the Ministry of Education and Training.

I say, if this is a government that wants to do something for people, and it has all the words that indicate that it wants to do something for people, then why don't

you have systems that work, that respond to the applicants, the supplicants, the caring people who want to get back to work?

Here is a 53-year-old who is out of work and wants to get back in the workplace. He knows that his skills need upgrading. He's prepared to do everything to do that. He's demonstrated that already by attending courses. Yet why has the system under this government become so archaic and antiquated and rusty that people who do apply don't get a response?

It is inconceivable to me that this government doesn't stop and get its house in order so that those who are on the line and have skills, capabilities and interest to do something are in some way helped. That's the intention of the Transitions program and it is failing. We're dealing with a specific instance and I illustrate it in this presentation today, and I will attach these Hansard remarks with the name of my constituent and the detailed backup information, and I will call upon the Minister of Education and Training to do something about it, to respond to his personal need.

I have had in my constituency office, on an average of one a week, people who are trying to apply for funding and support from the province of Ontario through existing programs and they're caught up in a quagmire, they're caught up in the quicksand of a government that seems to have lost sight of those people who are the ones who have responsibilities to fulfil. They don't want to be out of work; they want to get going, and in order to get going, they need to get into a program and learn.

I had a situation of a woman who had applied and was to start a special program in March and the funding wasn't available. Now she's going to apply for May and she's told that the funding won't be available till June. She's now going to be expired; that program will not be offered again. She's losing her chance. Time is running out and the government has not corrected the problem.

I write letters to these people, we all write letters, and we're not getting answers. If only someone within those ministers' offices could understand the urgency of the people's needs—men and women who have been part of the building up of our province, caring, good people with children, families, responsibilities—who for circumstances beyond their control lost their jobs. Don't we owe something to them, if we have all the words in all these documents that the government puts out on its special programs, to follow through on them?

Maybe what you need is another Mr Martin. Dale Martin has been doing something in a positive way to help cut the red tape within the government when it has to do with the developmental process of new growth within the province. In fact, one of the surprises to me is that Mr Martin has succeeded in speeding up some of those processes that were caught in the red tape of government. Maybe what this government needs to have is a few more ombudspersons who will be available to people like the ones who I'm seeing in my riding office, because it goes into the system.

You're just wasting your time when you write to the Ministry of Labour, and it's almost as bad to Education and Training to get a response. If I could get some



commitment from these people as to the speed and dispatch that they're going to deal with the situations of people, then it would be a sense of having fulfilled my purpose as an MPP. But I'm not getting those answers and I go away more and more frustrated.

One of the questions I have on the order paper is, I'm asking each minister to give me an answer on how long it takes them to answer letters, what their letter response policy is. Because I have letters coming back from ministers in response to my earlier correspondence that are six and nine months old. How incomprehensible that the ministries can allow their systems to be so lax and so unresponsive as to not get back to other members of the Legislature sooner than that. When we write letters on behalf of constituents, we're hoping to expedite something; we're hoping to get a solution. What we get is stonewalled.

It's tremendously grievous to all the people we're trying to serve when a government is closing its door and closing its mind to the responsibility of serving the public. That's what we're here for. We're here to serve people, and if you can't have the courtesy to respond to people and to react to the needs they've got, find a way to do so. The mail must just pile up because of the lack of response coming through. You've got the computers, you've got the people, you're going to get the money approved for the interim supply that continues to pay the salaries of the offices of the bureaucracy. Then why in the Sam Hill can't we start to get some real answers to the questions that we're asking?

The question I ask about this good person who came to me today who is applying for help within the Transitions program typifies something of the frustration and the problem of people who are saying, "Please help me." They come to me, a member of the Legislature, and all I can say to this good man, and the woman the week before, is, "I'll do my best." I'll tell you—I'm sure members from the other parties as well would share this—I'm not satisfied with what my best is. It hurts me. I'll do everything I can to help people. I plead, in the most positive way, may this government understand the urgent need to respond to the individual needs of people who are out there who are crying for help.

Those are my two local stories. When I talk about the Interim Waste Authority and Bill 143 and that whole process, that will go down in my memory as the worst three years of my life in fighting Mrs Grier and Bob Rae and this government on their stupid positions with regard to having huge landfills within the Metro Toronto area.

The second biggest upset that I have as a member of the opposition is the lack of respect and regard by the government and its systems. When you talk to the individual ministers—and there have been a number of instances where those ministers have been very, very forthcoming in trying to help find a solution—the system isn't working right now and I'm pleading that they will look at the urgent needs that are coming through their offices and do something about it, not just words. Get it so the system starts to work.

I'd like to comment for a moment, if I may, on the failure of this government and the social contract. Last

year, when the social contract was brought in, on behalf of our party I introduced some 29 amendments that would have modified the social contract in a way that we felt it could become more workable, and none of our amendments was approved. At that time the Liberals, who were opposing this social contract, made no amendments to the bill whatsoever. They were so opposed to the process, for whatever reasons—I'm not to comment on the Liberals—that they at least made no amendments at all to the legislation. We at least tried to bring in amendments that could have made it more workable. None of those amendments was accepted, not even the easiest one of the lot, where I asked the government to report to the Legislature within a year following the introduction of the social contract to tell us just how well it was going and give us a report card on the money saved and jobs lost, just a report card on the accounting of the effect of the social contract.

The government turned down that amendment, along with all the others we had. So doing really means the government doesn't have to come clean and tell us just really what is the net impact of the social contract.

Further to the whole debate on the social contract, I put order paper questions in, and these are the questions you write out carefully. I was asking to gain access to look at some of the social contract agreements that the different sectors had agreed upon and submitted to the Minister of Finance, as was required under the bill. The government has prevented myself and my researcher from having access to review those contracts. We're now into 10 months since those contracts were submitted and piled up in rooms somewhere in Queen's Park Crescent, and I still haven't seen them, so how do I really know what transpired between the province and those different sectoral groups? I get the reports once in a while, but I have not been satisfied. What the government has done is successfully stonewall the opposition from gaining true insight into the impact of the social contract.

1700

A lot of people will give credit to the Premier for at least having had the courage to stand up to the unions and the public service. If you call that courageous, you might also have started to think about the long-term impact, because the social contract, in my view, provides only short-term savings. At the end of the three years, there will be significant payouts and catch-up days given under the terms of the social contract. We don't know what the total cost of the future impact of the social contract is going to be. Not unlike wage and price controls, when they were lifted from Ottawa a number of years ago, there was a bubble that had to burst after it was over, and we're going to taste that not too long from now.

I don't think this government can eliminate the layoffs and the economic damage all this is going to cost, because when the social contract is over, there is going to be still more work to be done to bring the bureaucracy and the civil service into the kind of condition and shape it should be.

Probably one of the worst things that's happened during the past year with the social contract is that the

eye of the government is off the issue of serving people. So many people have been wrapped up in social contract discussions and debates and issues and the days off—the Rae days, as they're so often called—that they really haven't been able to concentrate on how to do the job better, how to serve the community better. Maybe that becomes part of the reason my constituent I just talked about on the Transitions program hasn't been able to get answers. People would use the excuse, "Well, we had a Rae day," or "We had a day off," or "We were doing social contract things."

The priorities of this government have become confused and unfocused during this period, because the effort that's gone into the social contract is not worth all the damage and everything else it has created. There are ways this government could have provided for the savings and the downsizing, and it could have been done without the kind of damage that has been perpetrated on both the public service and the people of Ontario by virtue of the way this has been done.

I believe the government has chosen to trample the rights of workers and management throughout the public service in a way that is almost irreparable. For us to sit by and be able to do nothing about it is one of the most frustrating things as a member of opposition: conscientiously presenting a series of amendments, hoping to do something about it, hoping to find a way to build compromises into the system, and singlemindedly the government went ahead with its plan. They did not restructure our government system to ensure long-lasting savings. They came out with a program that will make it look good for them for one or two years, but the next government to come into office is going to have a very major cleanup to perform.

During the last several weeks, our finance and economics committee has been meeting in preparation for the future budget, and there are a number of recommendations our party put forward. With the help of Mr Carr, the member for Oakville South, we came forward with a 20-page document outlining some 20 recommendations. I'd like to touch on a few of those, because the danger exists right now that the government may be acting on a number of assumptions that people are going to support their changes.

First of all, we are asking the government to reject all the recommendations of the Fair Tax Commission. I don't know how many millions of dollars it cost to come out with their 1,000-page report. We are just saying that the recommendations of the Fair Tax Commission really will discourage saving and reduce the saving rate in the province of Ontario. We see the Fair Tax Commission suggesting that there is room to increase payroll taxes in Ontario. They make a number of suggestions about how we move around the property taxes, to move educational funding elsewhere, yet they leave within their recommendations the possibility for educational taxes to come back again. I suggest that this government just let the dust accumulate on it and let it be set aside for the foreseeable future. The Fair Tax Commission really has nothing to offer to bring us out of the doldrums.

May the government also recognize the profoundly

negative impact on the business community of the Workers' Compensation Board assessment. I had another call this morning from another constituent. He had just received his assessment, and he just can't believe how big the bill is. If there's anything that kills the incentive for job creation, it is just this kind of bureaucracy we're building in Ontario.

Our party is suggesting that workers' compensation become an issue of importance to the Bob Rae government. Let there be an immediate freeze on all entitlements to people within the WCB who are calling on it for help. Let there be a reduction in benefit levels from 90% to 80% of their net earnings. Let there be a replacement of the political appointees in the WCB management structure and bring in insurance professionals who can help set that ship of state in the right direction. Introduce spending controls and value-for-money audits within the WCB. Let there be a cost-benefit analysis of the privatization option and of the option of contracting out certain services and functions.

The WCB is a mess. It's got beyond a \$10-billion unfunded liability. It's just beyond the ability of the people of Ontario to understand how the WCB will ever get out of it. This is going to be a continuing cost to the taxpayers of the province.

I'm suggesting as well in our report that the government of Ontario eliminate the \$50 corporate registration fee, as the compliance costs for that fee for businesses are greater than the fee itself. You don't call it a tax any more; you just levy a brand-new fee. Companies have to pay the \$50 fee: Either they pay it or they're deincorporated. There are lists and lists and lists of those companies now delineated in the Gazette. I suggest the government should just eliminate that process; that the system is just another gouge on businesses, another inconvenience for them, and it's also another cost for this government to process.

We as a party are committed to repealing Bill 40, the labour legislation brought in by this government last year. We would like to bring in legislation that would democratize—that's the new word: democratize—the organized labour movement in Ontario, and we would include requirements for broader use of the secret ballot within the labour movement.

We believe also that the government of Ontario should adopt a balanced budget law, modelled on the one introduced in New Brunswick and Alberta, so that we as a government are moving towards the day when we will have a balanced budget, not living beyond our means, not building a deficit of over \$10 billion. I mean, \$1 billion or \$2 billion was bad enough, but now when you look at the accumulated deficit—and "deficit" is just another word for deferred taxes—it's over \$70 billion. The cost of paying the interest alone on this deficit for Ontario now almost exceeds the cost of our health care, the cost of our education. Let's start bringing our money under control. Any organization or any government that is overspending to that extent is living beyond its means and should move towards a balanced budget law.

There should be a moratorium imposed on the non-profit housing program. I have an excellent article here,



and if I had more time I'd get into it, to just describe the cost of the non-profit housing program in Ontario. It isn't working. It's going to cost, for every 5,000 units that are built, over a 35-year period, when you look at the cost of those units and the subsidies that are going into it, it's going to be \$1.75 billion.

You're making decisions that may offer short-term jobs and opportunities, you may have an opportunity to help people, but there are definitely other ways of addressing the housing needs of people in the province of Ontario rather than the housing program that has been endorsed and built up by this government.

1710

We believe strongly that the government has to act immediately to link the welfare budget to skills training and job creation initiatives, to improve the management and accountability of the social assistance program and to reduce the losses due to fraud and poor administration.

The whole problem with social assistance—the question was asked in the Legislature today by the member for Wellington as he was talking about the way in which people are abusing social assistance in Ontario. The cost of social assistance in Ontario—if you had it to the same terms and guidelines as in other provinces, we could save over \$1 billion a year.

Let's begin to look at reform of social assistance, not only to look at getting rid of the fraud, but tying it into future opportunities so that people will not see it as such a huge, comfortable existence but as a safety net that allows them to get back out and work. We are supportive of a strong, wholesome social assistance program, but let's have it so it's balanced; let's have it so that it works for people.

Reading articles about what's going on in Wisconsin and different jurisdictions, there are ways in which we can work together with those who have the need. The government can come up with these innovations. It just can't continue to do it as it is. I will close off at that point.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Markham for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I want to comment on my friend from Markham here and some of his comments and maybe some of what he left out. It's easy, I know, and you can fall for that trap, so I've been told, when you're in opposition, to only criticize and not look at the good things.

He didn't mention, for example, something that I think is a good benefit for the good folks up in Durham-York, like the FarmPlus program. There's a program that wasn't talked about—I think it was just an oversight; he probably would really have liked to talk about it as the Finance critic—where there can be credits given to people who are going to lend so that we can continue on with the farming community that active stuff that does take place.

There is some political rhetoric that takes place in a debate on a monetary issue like this. My friend and colleague here might argue that Bill 40 is a terrible piece

of legislation that shouldn't have gone forward, but of course he doesn't reflect on the fact that you know for the past couple of years we've had less downtime in this province due to strikes because of things like Bill 40. Labour relations are really moving along quite well.

I know over the last few days there were lots of arguments in this Legislature that, "Let's see your plan. Let's see what you're going to do. Let's legislate those Hydro workers back to work," before we even allowed that negotiation process to take place. My colleague here talked about a few of those things, talked at length about welfare, but didn't talk about the child and family support plan, which can help those women get the payment that's been court-ordered to them so that they don't end up on assistance or the drain on assistance itself isn't so high.

It's easy when you're in opposition to only be critical. I just caution the member not to get caught up into the opposition rhetoric of it all but put a little bit of balance into it, as I'm sure he would have if he had maybe more time. Maybe he'll do that at the end, in his two minutes.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I actually was quite impressed with a number of things the honourable member for Markham had to say. I must admit that normally I'm a little more used to him entering into a tirade against former Liberal governments and I congratulate him for concentrating on some of the issues of the day and, as the member for St Catharines said earlier, not perhaps dwelling in the past or continuing just to throw unwarranted attacks around this place. I thought many of the points were quite valid.

The \$50 fee to business is something the member raised. That is something I've heard from a lot of people in my constituency who are quite upset about that. I think what upsets them more than anything is they don't understand what it's for. Imagine you have a business, you have a corporation that has been functioning for a number of years; you even have one that's just sitting on a shelf and is not particularly active, and you get a notice from the government simply demanding that you've got to fill out this application to keep your charter alive and, by the way, send in \$50.

They don't say that there's a purpose, that they're attempting to, I don't know, perhaps solve some problem in the relationship between the business community and the consumer division of the government. We don't see any attempt to turn around and explain these kinds of things to people.

It seems to me that in the middle of the middle of the night a light went on and the Minister of Finance said: "Aha! If we charge every corporation registered in this province \$50 to send us in their address, whether it's changed or not, to send us in information, whether that information has changed in years, \$50 times a whole bunch of companies can make a lot of money."

I think there are a lot of things that the member has pointed out that this government is doing without any reasoned approach to the taxpayers who pay the bills in this province.

**Mr Turnbull:** The member for Markham has brought cogent comments to this debate, but the most important

remark that he made was on the need for balanced budget legislation. He spoke about that, and it's something I feel very strongly about, because all of the people of our generation have piled up debts for future generations to pay off.

The pages who are here should pay particular attention. Your parents and all of the people in this assembly are not going to pay off the debts that are being built up, that have been built up by all political parties, but none more so than this current government. We have about \$70 billion worth of debt in this province today. It's unconscionable. There's always the belief that somehow around the corner there's going to be the moon and the stars to pay off this.

It's not true. These young people are going to end up paying for it. That is why we need balanced budget legislation, so that we stop any political party from any of the malarkey that this present government has got into, where it is piling up debts, it is hiding debts. As we pointed out, it isn't being hidden from the bond-rating agencies.

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** Cut social services. Cut the education for young people.

**Mr Turnbull:** I hear one of the NDP yapping away. They should pay attention to the fact that debt is being piled up for the young people to pay off in the future. It is not fair. If ever there was something that the whole of this Legislature should be unanimous on, it is the fact that we should stop piling up debt and we should have balanced budget legislation so that no government of any political stripe will be allowed to pile up those debts. For that, I compliment my friend the member for Markham.

**Mr Winninger:** I'm really quite disappointed to hear the member for Markham, who should know better, fail to acknowledge many of the constructive initiatives this government has taken, not only to protect existing jobs but also to create new ones.

The numbers are quite impressive. We're looking at 300,000 jobs the government has been involved in either protecting or creating just over the past few years, starting with the anti-recession fund and then the Jobs Ontario Capital, Housing and Training programs, and more recently our participation in the Ontario-Canada infrastructure program, just to name a few. I forgot to mention the community action fund.

The member for Markham denigrates a program for older worker adjustment which has proven to be quite successful. There are 24,000 people currently receiving benefits under the program, there are 1,000 individuals applying each month to the program and the total budget for the program is \$17.1 million. Clearly, we're not only interested in protecting and creating jobs for younger workers; we also have a very concerted campaign to see that older workers are not forgotten, that they're given the necessary skills they need to continue to compete in a changing economy.

The member for Markham also mentioned social housing. Quite frankly, many have noted that the majority of housing starts in Canada are right here in Ontario, and the majority of those housing starts are due to social

housing funding from this government, which not only creates affordable housing, an enduring asset for the people of Ontario, but creates a number of short- and long-term jobs that this economy so desperately needs.

1720

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** The member for Markham, you have two minutes to reply.

**Mr Cousens:** I thank other members for their comments generally. Especially, I'd like to thank the member for York Mills. I compliment him for the leadership that he has given to our party and the very commonsense approach that he brings to this House. The member for York Mills, as a businessman, certainly understands the reality of the real world and is trying to bring that kind of leadership here. I appreciate his support on these fundamental issues of the economy.

I also thank the member for Mississauga West. He raises the point again about the \$50 fee, and the question is unanswered by this government, why that extra tax? If you look at the cost of these taxes that have been raised by this government in the last several years, it has resulted in the loss of thousands of jobs, because those jobs have left Ontario for ever. Chesebrough-Ponds, in my own riding, has just announced that it will be closing down its operations and consolidating elsewhere in the States, and some 200 jobs of some of the best people in our community are now disappearing. Those are people whom I care about and I think we all do.

The problem we have is that the member for London South fails to recognize that I support the Transitions program, but isn't it tragic? People who are fully eligible, with the dream and the hope and everything else, are turned away. They don't get the help and they don't even get an answer. So the process for letting those applications be clear and understood just doesn't work. I'm in favour of doing the right thing to help people. You say the right words but it's not happening for them.

To the member for Durham-York, I appreciate it's hard to come out with balanced, positive statements, but one thing I'll say that the government has done and done well, and it followed through from the Liberals: 407 is under way. When Bill Wrye announced it that was good news, and when this government continued the promise, that was good. We have to continue to build an infrastructure, and that is essential to make this province strong.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you. Any further debate?

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** Her Majesty's government needs supply and of course the old maxim applies, "No supply without a redress of grievance." I have two or three items, at least a couple of which could be categorized as grievances, that I would put before the Assembly this afternoon. But let me begin on a positive note.

As the member for North Renfrew, where the concern is overwhelmingly about jobs, one of the sectors in our part of the province that is most important to economic growth and job creation and job protection is the forest economy. To its credit, the Ontario government, under



the Ministry of Natural Resources, has just produced what I call the Brown report, which looks at critical issues of forest policy and timber supply to the sawmills of Pembroke and Barry's Bay and Mattawa and Eganville, those small and large communities in my part of the world which employ hundreds and thousands of people and which, without the forest economy, would be staring at unemployment.

That sector has been through an extremely painful four-year downturn, though there are some indications that the worst is now behind us. I think the government is to be congratulated for this Brown report, a review of wood supply and distribution in the southern portion of the central region of Ontario, authored by W.J. Brown of the Algonquin Forestry Authority, which is a crown agency of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.

This is I think a very good blueprint for the government to consider. There must be an action plan. The people of the Ottawa Valley are expecting that this government and any subsequent government will take the necessary steps to address the key issues and the very constructive advice which the government has received in this report.

One element of the report I want to focus upon, however, is that the government is warned by Mr Brown, a distinguished forester and well-known public servant in our part of Ontario, that if there are any more withdrawals from the forest economy—in other words, if the government reserves or withdraws any more of the timber supply in east-central Ontario—communities like Pembroke and Barry's Bay and Bancroft and Eganville are going to face a more difficult time and those withdrawals will in fact aggravate the unemployment situation rather than help it.

Anyway, a good report, I was pleased to receive it and I hope the government moves forward with its implementation, as I believe it will.

As Energy critic for the official opposition, I want to take a moment today to say how pleased I am that we have apparently averted a Hydro strike, and I will be very interested to see what the terms of the tentative agreement involve. As has often been observed in these matters, the devil is in the details, and I expect that we will find some measure of devilment in the details of this agreement, but I do want to congratulate both parties for coming to a resolution.

I note the intervention of the Premier. Bob Rae has carried on the tradition of Bill Davis and David Peterson and John Robarts, which tradition is simply this: that in any matter of significance at Ontario Hydro, the Premier is in fact the minister in charge, as it should be.

There has been some interest, by the way, on the part of some in the media and in the community as to where we stand as legislators in so far as Hydro as an essential service, and I'd like to take a moment to simply put on the record my view and the view of the Ontario Liberal Party.

We of course support the collective bargaining process and we think that it should in fact be given every opportunity to produce a resolution. But there is no one, and

certainly no one in the Liberal caucus and no one in Ontario in my view, who would dispute the obvious fact that Hydro and electricity are essential, vital services. There is no dispute of that. The Liberal Party of Ontario believes electricity to be a vital, essential resource.

But it does not follow, from our point of view, that then the only option is to lock the giant utility and the government into the cumbersome and very expensive and not at all satisfactory option of compulsory binding arbitration. We believe that this is not the best alternative in this connection. We think, recognizing that Hydro is an essential service and recognizing now, with the preponderance of our electricity coming from the nuclear plants, that we cannot take a strike—and everybody who knows anything about the electricity business in Ontario today knows that we cannot take a strike. There's certainly no one at the bargaining table, no one from CUPE 1000, no one from the professional society of engineers at Hydro and certainly no one in the utility business, whether it's Hydro or the local utility, who really believes that, with 65% of our electricity now coming from the nuclear plants, we can actually take a strike.

Having said that, there is another instrument I think that is there to protect the vital public interest, and that is the instrument which we saw used last weekend: the Premier of the day standing in his place, whether it's Bob Rae, David Peterson or Bill Davis, and saying, "If you don't settle in the collective bargaining process, I will settle it for you, and we will intervene as a government to legislate that there will not be a strike." It seems to me that this is, as a practical matter, an instrument that has evolved over the last number of years and is useful, is practical and it works, apparently.

I want to say to the House and anybody who's watching that I was surprised to hear my friends in the third party asking almost for—I believe it's their position—automatically compulsory binding arbitration for the giant utility, because any of us who know anything about the problems of that in the areas of police and fire don't want to bring those problems, those costs and those rigidities to the very complex subject of electricity and utility management across the province.

In summary on the Hydro question, I'm pleased that we seem to have a tentative agreement. I hope the deal holds. The devil will be in the details. I expect to see some devilment in the details, and stay tuned, because I think the debate will continue as we come back after Easter.

I believe in the collective bargaining process. Though my colleagues and I affirm that Hydro is an essential service, a vital service, we can't take a strike, but that doesn't necessarily mean that we have to lock into compulsory binding arbitration, which is certainly not our preference.

We think the vital public interests in this whole area, which are obvious, can be protected, as they were protected this time and in the past, by a prime ministerial directive, usually fairly late in the process: "Settle, or I and the Legislature will settle it for you." I want to be clear on that so there is no confusion as to where the Liberals stand on the question of Hydro as a vital or

essential service, and the second issue: What is the best instrument to achieve and protect the public interest, which is real and obvious in this respect?

1730

**Mr Winninger:** Why didn't Lyn say it?

**Mr Conway:** Well, I'm the Energy critic, and I'm simply putting the party position, as I have just done, on this aspect of the question.

I want to move to two other subjects, quickly to tuition. I am really upset about the government's policy of increasing tuition for college and university students by 10% this coming year and 10% the year after.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** What would you have done?

**Mr Conway:** I want to say to my friends opposite, what would I have done? By your deeds, ye shall be judged. I want to say, in the pit of one of the worst recessions in memory, where youth unemployment is, as a practical matter, now probably approaching 25%, we have said to young people, who are still the largest group of college and university students, "You can afford to pay another 20% by way of a tuition increase over the next two years."

I am not saying that there ought not to have been a tuition increase, but never before has there been an increase of such magnitude. No government in my memory or in my research has ever imposed such a huge increase in tuition on students, particularly young people. And we've done it when? We've done it in the late winter of 1994, when all of us, whether we're Liberal, Tory or New Democrat, face a parade of bright, talented, well-educated young people coming to our offices, coming to our homes and saying, "There is simply not much, if anything, for us in this apparently jobless recovery."

I want to say to the government, and I want to say to anybody else who's listening, including the Toronto Star editorial writer who wrote that piece on tuition increases the other day, more or less agreeing with the government, that my point is simply this: We have stuck these kids, these young people with a walloping increase at a time when their futures are more clouded than at any point certainly in my lifetime.

I ask this question, and I ask it to all in the House and everyone beyond, but particularly to the university community: What corresponding sacrifice have we asked for and exacted from my tenured professorial friends and from the university bureaucrats? I think this is unfair and it is unseemly, and it is a terrible, terrible signal to send to the young people of Ontario and of Canada, that somehow in this awful recessionary environment, "You young people can afford to pay 20% more."

When I talk to my tenured professorial friends, I don't get any sense that they have given this kind of blood. When I talk to university bureaucrats, I don't get any sense that they have been asked or have in fact offered up this kind of sacrifice. I say, I hope in a—I was going to say "in a non-partisan sense." I suppose it can't be that. But what are we telling young people? I've been here 20 years, and I have never seen the despair and the

hopelessness facing an enormous group of extremely bright, want-to-work, want-to-succeed young people. What kind of signal, what kind of priority?

It's obvious to me that these young people are not organized. They don't have a Bob White or somebody leading their parade in the corridors of power. They don't have the Canadian Manufacturers' Association or some big business lobby. I'm telling you, we'd better think about this.

I understand the government's fiscal problem. I'm not arguing for 0%, but 20%? An unprecedented, record high increase at a time when these kids are facing horrible choices, in a decade where apparently it is going to be increasingly difficult for young people to find permanent, satisfying employment. So more and more of these people are going to college and to university to upgrade their skills, to improve their education, and we nail them at the door with a 20% increase. And we have the Premier, a bright guy, a good guy, I've got to believe, saying: "Don't worry. All this does is put the tuition back to where it was, in relative terms, in 1967 or 1968." I can't believe that.

I was a student in the late 1960s. I asked the research department to get me the statistics. Do you know what the youth unemployment stats were in Ontario in 1966 and 1967? About 3.5%. That's about full employment. I remember those days in the late 1960s. For guys like me and Jim Coyle, sitting up there in the press gallery, and many of the rest of you who are roughly of my age, when you graduated from high school—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Conway:** I'm just saying he's someone I know who's roughly my age.

I say to my friend Mr White, who I was reading about in the Waterloo Lutheran Alumni Review the other day, for anybody who's 40 or 45 years of age, you will remember well those days in the late 1960s when there were two jobs for every one of us. Now we have unemployment rates in the youth category, 15 to 24, of well over 20%. They're actually reported at 19.5%.

We are sending a terrible signal to the young people of Ontario that somehow they can afford to shoulder a very disproportionate share of this current burden. I ask again, have we asked a corresponding sacrifice really from the tenured professors and from the university bureaucrats?

Oh, they'll tell me at Western and at Queen's and at Laurentian that they've given a tremendous amount of blood. I am not convinced. Before the president of the University of Toronto and the president of the University of Western Ontario and the president of McMaster or the president of Queen's say, "Now, Conway, you're a former minister; you should know," all I know is that the young people I talk to today are extremely concerned about their prospects, and Bob Rae has sent them a signal that I think is altogether the wrong signal. We should be concerned about the kind of priority or lack thereof that shows to the group that is, in my view, the most disadvantaged in our society at the present time, particularly in terms of employment.

I want to turn, as a last matter today, now that I've got



myself a bit worked up, to another subject that really has me bothered.

Next week, I say to my colleagues, the House will welcome a new member, the member-elect from the district of Victoria-Haliburton, Chris Hodgson by name. I want to congratulate Mr Hodgson. I don't know him, but I know the family. He comes from a very distinguished public service, political and business family in the great county of Haliburton.

He will come to this place like his uncle Glen did in the 1960s and 1970s, and I think it was his great-uncle Claydon Wesley Hodgson, who sat for a number of years as a distinguished Conservative member of Parliament in Ottawa for Victoria-Haliburton. He won a hard-fought battle, and I congratulate him for that victory.

I want to say to the House that I was involved in that by-election and I was deeply concerned by one aspect of the campaign. I want to say to my Conservative friends that they had an excellent candidate and they ran in all other respects a creative and very innovative campaign. The video, the postcard I thought were excellent, and I want to congratulate them for that. As I say, I know Mr Hodgson and I think he is a fine young man and will do very well in this place. But he comes here with a cloud over his head, and he did not put that cloud there.

We saw in the Victoria-Haliburton by-election a politics of prejudice that deeply troubles me. We are also witnessing in this province today a very significant development, a very significant development in Ontario today. We are witnessing the death of one of the great parties in this province in the 20th century: The Ontario Progressive Conservative Party, which was the colossus in this province for many a decade and which governed as a moderate, centrist party, in the main, for much of the middle and later years of this century is dead and it's buried.

We have in its place a new party being born, called the Ontario Reform Conservative Party, led rather vigorously by Michael D. Harris, MPP from Nipissing. Mr Harris has taken his new party, the Ontario Reform Conservative Party, radically to the right, and he makes no apologies for that. That is of course his right as a party leader and as a politician.

1740

What I saw in Victoria-Haliburton on the question of same-sex benefits is a deeply troubling issue for me as an elected official. I want to say at the outset, I say sincerely to all members, I understand the room for an honest difference of opinion on that sensitive subject. I've said to my constituents that I will not be supporting Mr Murphy's Bill 45. I explained that to them months ago. I understand how others in this place will have a contrary view and that's the health of our system. That is the health of our system.

But what I saw in Victoria-Haliburton—and I have just one of the ads, they were radio ads. This ad appeared and it was no doubt written by Tory central here in Toronto, because the Hodgson family, in my experience, would not stoop to conquer in this fashion. Let me just read the ad that appeared in the Victoria-Haliburton press in

mid-March. It is sponsored, authorized, by the Progressive Conservative Party.

"Vote for job creation, not same-sex benefits. The Liberals and the NDP are pushing a new priority, giving gay and lesbian couples the same benefits as married couples. Only Chris Hodgson and the PCs are opposed. Chris believes that government should be focused on job creation, not on new spending schemes that will increase the cost of doing business in Ontario and drive jobs away. If you think that jobs should be the first priority for Victoria-Haliburton, vote Conservative on March 17."

My late grandfather sat in this place for the better part of 20 years, a long time ago. He used to talk to me about what he called the poisonous vapours of the back concessions.

He remembered until his dying day, and he was almost 102 years of age, a notorious by-election in eastern Ontario in November and December of 1936, the famous and awful battle of Hastings East where religion was the issue. It was probably one of the most expensive and one of the ugliest campaigns this province has ever seen.

One of his colleagues at the time who became a friend of mine later on was David Croll, then the only Jewish member, one of the very few Jewish members of this assembly. David Croll had a very distinguished public life. I remember David Croll telling me, very late in his life, that he had never seen such prejudice as he saw in that Hastings East by-election in 1936, when a calculated effort to make religion and prejudice around religion was made in that connection.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Conway:** Listen, I am trying to be straightforward, and listen, none of us, I suppose, has the exclusive province on virtue in this respect. I know enough about the political history of Ontario to know that.

But I can't remember, when I think about east Hastings—when I remember in the national capital in November 1980 when again, and I'm sorry to say it was the Tories in that campaign injected the language question into the Carleton by-election that perhaps the Minister of Housing will remember. And boy, it was Tory code, again eliciting all of the expected prejudice that you could imagine.

Now we have Victoria-Haliburton. I mean, how else would you take this? The Tories are for job creation and the Liberals and the New Democrats have as their top priority same-sex spousal benefits.

My friends, we are as a group of elected politicians in very bad odour and there are a whole series of factors for that. Our currency is debased. In some ways I think it is the most debased coinage we have seen in a long time and some of that debasement originates outside of our immediate circle.

But I want to say, and I want to say particularly to Michael Harris, that he would engage in what I can only call this kind of malicious fabrication, appealing as he did knowingly to base prejudice, he is playing with fire, because we live in a very complex, multifaceted, multi-racial society.

I simply want to say, Mr Speaker, through you to the

House, that this is a fire that, once started, may not be controllable.

A hundred years ago, there was a guy named George Marter, who succeeded a very progressive Conservative leader who never did win high office, W.R. Meredith. George Marter decided that the future for the Conservative Party then was a sharp turn to the right and exploit issues of prejudice. He came to nothing, and the very much more centrist and moderate J.P. Whitney, from my part of the province, took over the leadership of the party and brought that party into a moderate mainstream.

Mr Harris is perfectly within his rights, I suppose, to lead his Reform Conservative Party wherever he wishes to lead it. But I want to say that that ad campaign around that subject—and I say again, I recognize that it is a debate that affords a range of opinions, and it is sensitive. If you know anything about politics, you will know that issues around language, sex, religion are very, very explosive, and we have an obligation, and party leaders most especially have an obligation, as Abraham Lincoln once said, to appeal to the better angels of ourselves.

Let me tell you, Mr Speaker, this ad campaign produced a victory contaminated by disgrace. And I can say, after six campaigns and after having been here 18½ years, that I do not want office so badly that I am prepared to stoop to this kind of politics, because I'm going to tell you, if I have to win with this kind of incendiary pitch, then what I have won is worthless.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** Yes, but they don't see it that way, Sean.

**Mr Conway:** Well, I say to my friends everywhere, we are on the eve of an election campaign. We are on the eve of an election campaign, and we all know it is going to be a hard-fought campaign. We are also now a political culture where each of the major political parties has won the responsibility of government. And surely, surely, that experience in each of our parties has taught us something. It has taught us something about the sensitivity and the responsibility of government in office.

When I hear party leaders, as Michael Harris did in this case, blowing the dog-whistle of prejudice, when I hear the radical right-wing code being punched on all those highly sensitive buttons, I worry for my community and I worry for my province.

You know, the member for Markham, the Rev W. Donald Cousens, I believe the human rights critic for the third party—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Conway:** I'm telling you. The Rev W. Donald Cousens, who has made many a passionate speech in this place about human rights, I find out is in the business of drafting petitions, very pointed petitions calculated to incite on this subject, and in fact circulating the petitions on a calculated basis out into the hinterland as part, I think, of some kind of devil's pact with the radical right, asking for these petitions to be signed and, "Please return to Don Cousens, MPP for Markham and PC critic for Citizenship and human rights," the same Don Cousens who presented this House not long ago with Bill 55, An Act to amend the Human Rights Code.

The fact of the matter is, when I see this Harris campaign, this malicious fabrication, calculated, aforethought, to exploit the most sensitive issues and some of the most delicate divisions in home, community and province, I look to my friends in the Conservative Party. I look to people like Liz Witmer and Dianne Cunningham and Charlie Harnick and Ted Arnott, to name but four, people whom I know, whom I respect as good and decent and honourable people, who have stood in their place here and have gone home to London and to Arthur and to Willowdale and made I believe the right commitment on these issues. I ask myself, does Charlie Harnick, does Dianne Cunningham support this radical move to the right and this premeditated calculation of exploiting some of the baser prejudices in our society?

1750

*Interjection.*

**Mr Conway:** Mr Speaker, I simply want to say—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Turnbull:** How dare you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for York Mills, please.

**Mr Turnbull:** Sir, I ask this member across the way, the member for—

**Mr Conway:** My time.

**Mr Turnbull:** —the member for Downsview to retract his comment.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I haven't heard anything. If the member for Downsview has said anything wrong, you are an honourable member and I expect that you will apologize. Please do so.

**Mr Perruzza:** Mr Speaker, all I suggested—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Perruzza:** Yes. If by saying to the member for York Mills that he was part of the train—

*Interjection.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Please, I'm asking for an apology.

**Mr Perruzza:** I'm trying to—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Do you have an apology?

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Renfrew North.

**Mr Conway:** It was once written that politics was at one and the same time the most noble of the arts and the most soiled of professions. I want to say that in Victoria-Haliburton a few weeks ago we saw a pile of soiled linen. We would all do well, as we consider an approach to the people of Ontario, to remember Lincoln's very wise injunction. Let us all, and party leaders especially, remember to appeal to the better angels of ourselves, for to do otherwise would be further, in my view, to debase the already discounted currency in which we deal.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for York Mills, you have a point of order?

**Mr Turnbull:** No, not a point of order. I wanted to comment on the last speaker's speech.



**The Deputy Speaker:** Two minutes' comment.

**Mr Turnbull:** Unfortunately, two minutes is not adequate to respond to it. I appreciate my colleague the member for Renfrew North and the forthright way that he presents matters in this Legislature usually. I believe that he is fundamentally trying to play politics in this issue, because I will say to you, sir, that I very proudly campaigned with Nancy Jackman in the St George-St David by-election. She is an avowed lesbian. I will fight for the right of anybody of any sexual orientation to have fair representation.

The point that was made during the by-election was this, sir: It was only that jobs should be the top priority of this government. Instead, we have heard that the government's priority list, according to the press that so royally likes to flail the Conservatives as having moved to the right—that same press are the ones that have reported that the number one priority of this government is to introduce same-sex benefits.

I will not be supporting the same-sex benefits legislation, for the simple reason I believe that we have too many expenses for both companies and for governments today. We must concentrate on jobs and only jobs.

I am annoyed that I do not have a fuller opportunity to respond to the member for Renfrew North, whom normally I have a lot of agreement with, because I think he is for political reasons trying to cast the Conservative Party, through that tactic, into the far right. We are not, sir, a far-right party, but we are a party that believes that the marketplace should work and that we should remove a lot of legislation and a lot of the tax burden which is on companies, which should be the priority of this government.

**Mr White:** I'd like to compliment the member for Renfrew North on his very eloquent speech and to comment as well upon the very difficulty that he brought out at the tail end of his speech—very difficult times. At the last he cited a by-election during the Depression and the difficult times that we as a government have during this recession.

Winds of intolerance are blowing across this land when we see people rising to positions of power, when we see political victories, based upon the basest of what we are as a people. I think it is very difficult for us to resist those, and those are the things that this government has stood for very strongly and very keenly: not just jobs, but we see there to be no contradiction between social justice, social equity and a jobs agenda. There is no contradiction between people having a fair share in our community and there being jobs created for our entire community. We see that with the numbers of jobs that have been created and with the level of social justice that has also been created during these last several years.

I know that my friend from Renfrew North would have no disagreement whatsoever with many of the planks that we have put into place. I think these reflect the better parts of our community and I'm sure they have his support. I think this combination of jobs and justice is difficult to withstand when we have an attack from the far right of inequity being trumpeted and, frankly, some of the worst community spirit.

**M. Jean Poirier (Prescott et Russell) :** Je voudrais également féliciter mon collègue de Renfrew-Nord pour l'exactitude de sa présentation. Nous connaissons mon collègue de Renfrew-Nord depuis nombre d'années et nous savons très bien qu'il est éminemment capable de décrire très fidèlement une situation qui est très grave.

En ce qui a trait à la dernière partie de son discours, je n'ai pu que noter, justement, qu'il a touché une corde très sensible auprès de mes collègues du troisième parti. Effectivement, ce que nous avons vu dans l'élection partielle de Victoria-Haliburton, c'est une situation que les gens ont vécue quand même assez difficilement, et malheureusement je pense que ce sera un peu un augure de la prochaine élection provinciale générale qui aura lieu en Ontario dans un avenir pas trop lointain.

Je pense que la description qu'a faite mon collègue de Renfrew-Nord, c'est une description très fidèle de ce qu'ont ressenti les gens. C'est très inquiétant lorsqu'un groupe parlementaire va viser et préciser et se concentrer sur certains points en particulier lorsque l'économie de tout l'Ontario et de tout le Canada est en train de subir une révolution qui ne s'annonce pas pour le meilleur.

Donc, moi, j'admire le courage de mon collègue de Renfrew-Nord. Je trouve qu'il a décrit très fidèlement une situation qui était très difficile à vivre, et je pense qu'il dit très fort ce que plusieurs personnes ont pensé tout bas mais qui n'ont peut-être pas la verve et la facilité de dire la vérité de la façon dont mon collègue de Renfrew-Nord est capable de le faire.

J'espère que la prochaine campagne électorale ne sera pas une répétition de ce qui s'est passé dans l'élection partielle de Victoria-Haliburton. J'espère que non, mais j'espère que ce sera une campagne qui va être beaucoup plus propre et qui va se concentrer sur les vrais dossiers de l'heure : la création d'emplois et le bien-être de l'Ontario globalement et du Canada.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Further comments?

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I want to make some brief comments in response to the comments made by the member for Renfrew North in respect to the Conservative Party in Ontario and the Victoria-Haliburton by-election.

Clearly, the comments were inappropriate in respect to the debate today on interim supply. Aside from that, they were extremely offensive, but I'm not surprised, having watched the member on the night of the by-election and the venom that spewed forth on television that evening from the member for Renfrew North.

We've heard the NDP member supporting his very nasty remarks in this chamber, but I want to point out to the viewers that these comments are coming from members of parties who lost a by-election. I think the viewers should keep in mind that what we're hearing here are sore losers trying to address one issue in a campaign, when the reality is that we had an outstanding candidate in Victoria-Haliburton, an outstanding organization and an outstanding leader in Michael Harris.

**Mr Perruzza:** For this kind of politics you strap yourself in.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Downsview.

**Mr Runciman:** I think, again, the member's comments are not surprising. Frequently, we have this holier-than-thou response from the member for Renfrew North. His arrogance was typical of the Liberal government. That's why they're no longer in office.

In respect to Victoria-Haliburton, I think his remarks can also be construed as a significant insult to the people of Victoria-Haliburton. They did not make their decision based on one issue alone; they made it based on a host of issues and they made the right decision.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Renfrew North, you have two minutes to reply.

**Mr Conway:** Let me say again, I know the Hodgson family. He is a very fine young man. He will, I think, do very well in this place, as his uncle did and his great-uncle did in Ottawa. The Conservative campaign I said in most respects I thought was very creative and very innovative and I give them full marks for that. Of course I don't like to lose, but I understand what happened there. The public is never wrong, and I've lost before.

I say to my friend from York Mills, I thought I said that there were a lot of good things. Chris Hodgson ran a good campaign. I believe he is a good guy. The brochure and the video were great, very creative, very innovative, and I give full marks for that. I don't believe this is sour grapes.

I am angry about one thing. I'm angry about this ad which says, "Vote for job creation, not same-sex benefits," print ads and radio ads that said: "The Tory priority

is job creation. The Liberals' and the NDP's only priority is same-sex spousal benefits." I repeat: That was not done by Chris Hodgson; that was done by Mike Harris and Tory central. That was, in my view, premeditated and it is a malicious fabrication.

Then I see the petitions which are being distributed presumably by Don Cousens, the Rev W. Donald Cousens, MPP, PC human rights critic. I ask you to look at these petitions and ask yourself, who's playing with fire?

I say in conclusion that we have an obligation on all sides, most especially as political leaders, on the critical and divisive questions, to rise above the base prejudices, for if we do not, we will run the risk of propelling our society backwards into an abyss where government for any of us will not be worth a jot or tittle.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**Mr White:** No. It's after 6.

**Mr Eves:** I'm already up on a point of order. The member for Renfrew North was eloquent, as usual, if not somewhat opinionated during his remarks. I only heard about the last five minutes of his remarks, but perhaps you, as Speaker, could enlighten me and tell me what they have to do with interim supply.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 1804.









# CONTENTS

Wednesday 30 March 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Closing of campgrounds</b>                 |      |
| Mr Cleary .....                               | 5263 |
| <b>Harassment and discrimination policies</b> |      |
| Mrs Cunningham .....                          | 5263 |
| <b>Young Voices report</b>                    |      |
| Ms Akande .....                               | 5263 |
| <b>Retail sales tax</b>                       |      |
| Mr McGuinty .....                             | 5263 |
| <b>Elmvale Maple Syrup Festival</b>           |      |
| Mr McLean .....                               | 5264 |
| <b>Panorama programs</b>                      |      |
| Mr Wood .....                                 | 5264 |
| <b>Casino gambling</b>                        |      |
| Mr McClelland .....                           | 5264 |
| <b>Wetlands</b>                               |      |
| Mr Jordan .....                               | 5265 |
| <b>Don Valley Brickworks</b>                  |      |
| Mr Malkowski .....                            | 5265 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Government's agenda</b>                |            |
| Mr Conway .....                           | 5267       |
| Mr Rae .....                              | 5267, 5269 |
| Mr Harris .....                           | 5269       |
| <b>Automobile insurance</b>               |            |
| Mr Elston .....                           | 5268       |
| Mr Charlton .....                         | 5268       |
| <b>Head-injury treatment</b>              |            |
| Mr Harris .....                           | 5270       |
| Mrs Grier .....                           | 5270       |
| <b>Workplace Health and Safety Agency</b> |            |
| Mr Mahoney .....                          | 5271       |
| Mr Mackenzie .....                        | 5271       |
| <b>Social assistance</b>                  |            |
| Mr Arnott .....                           | 5272       |
| Mr Silipo .....                           | 5272       |
| Mr Harris .....                           | 5272       |
| <b>Water quality</b>                      |            |
| Mr Wildman .....                          | 5273       |
| Mr Offer .....                            | 5273       |
| <b>Government spending</b>                |            |
| Mr Offer .....                            | 5274       |
| Mr Charlton .....                         | 5274       |

## Highway construction

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| Mr Villeneuve ..... | 5274 |
| Mr Pouliot .....    | 5274 |

## PETITIONS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>WCB premiums</b>                           |      |
| Mr Mahoney .....                              | 5277 |
| <b>Haemodialysis</b>                          |      |
| Mr Jim Wilson .....                           | 5277 |
| <b>Education financing</b>                    |      |
| Mr Abel .....                                 | 5277 |
| <b>Violence</b>                               |      |
| Ms Poole .....                                | 5277 |
| <b>Harassment and discrimination policies</b> |      |
| Mrs Cunningham .....                          | 5278 |
| <b>Land-lease communities</b>                 |      |
| Mr O'Connor .....                             | 5278 |
| Mr Mills .....                                | 5279 |
| <b>Labour dispute</b>                         |      |
| Mr Mahoney .....                              | 5278 |
| <b>Firearms safety</b>                        |      |
| Mr Villeneuve .....                           | 5278 |
| Mr Murdoch .....                              | 5279 |
| Mr Sorbara .....                              | 5280 |
| <b>Dietitians</b>                             |      |
| Mr Murphy .....                               | 5278 |
| <b>Medical examinations</b>                   |      |
| Mr O'Connor .....                             | 5279 |
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>                     |      |
| Mr Sorbara .....                              | 5279 |
| Mr Arnott .....                               | 5279 |

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Standing committee on regulations and private bills, Ms Haeck</b> |      |
| Ms Haeck .....   | 5280 |
| Adopted .....  | 5280 |

## FIRST READINGS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Corporations Tax Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 146, Mr Laughren</b> |      |
| Mr Laughren .....  | 5280 |
| Agreed to .....  | 5280 |

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| <b>Interim supply, Mr Laughren, notice of motion number 23</b> |                  |
| Mr Stockwell .....   | 5281, 5284       |
| Mr Bisson .....  | 5283             |
| Mr Bradley .....   | 5283, 5284       |
| Mr Turnbull ....   | 5284, 5294, 5299 |
| Mr Cousens ....  | 5289, 5290, 5295 |
| Mr Winninger .....   | 5289, 5295       |
| Mrs Fawcett .....  | 5289             |
| Mr O'Connor .....  | 5294             |
| Mr Mahoney .....   | 5294             |
| Mr Conway .....  | 5295, 5301       |
| Mr White .....   | 5300             |
| Mr Poirier .....   | 5300             |
| Mr Runciman .....  | 5300             |
| Deemed adjourned .....   | 5301             |

## OTHER BUSINESS

|                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| <b>Bud Tangney</b>             |      |
| Mr Rae .....                   | 5265 |
| Mr Elston .....                | 5266 |
| Mr Sterling .....              | 5267 |
| <b>Use of question period</b>  |      |
| Mr Perruzza .....              | 5275 |
| Mr Elston .....                | 5275 |
| The Speaker .....              | 5275 |
| Mr Offer .....                 | 5275 |
| Mr Stockwell .....             | 5275 |
| <b>Minister's comments</b>     |      |
| Mr Eves .....                  | 5275 |
| Mr Charlton .....              | 5276 |
| Mr Elston .....                | 5276 |
| The Speaker .....              | 5276 |
| <b>Members' privilege</b>      |      |
| Mr Runciman .....              | 5277 |
| <b>Parliamentary procedure</b> |      |
| Mr Stockwell .....             | 5280 |
| Mr Laughren .....              | 5281 |
| Mr Charlton .....              | 5281 |
| Mr Turnbull .....              | 5281 |

# TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 30 mars 1994

## PREMIÈRE LECTURE

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant la Loi sur l'imposition des corporations,</b> |      |
| projet de loi 146,   |      |
| <i>M. Laughren</i> .....   | 5280 |

## MOTIONS ÉMANANT DU GOUVERNEMENT

|                             |      |
|-----------------------------|------|
| <b>Crédits provisoires,</b> |      |
| <i>Mr Laughren</i> .....    | 5281 |
| <i>M. Poirier</i> .....     | 5300 |



No. 106

N° 106

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

Thursday 31 March 1994

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

Jeudi 31 mars 1994

Speaker  
Honourable David WarnerClerk  
Claude L. DesRosiersPrésident  
L'honorable David WarnerGreffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers*50th anniversary***1944–1994***50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 31 March 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 31 mars 1994

The House met at 1002.

Prayers.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

### WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT (RE-EMPLOYMENT), 1993

#### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES ACCIDENTS DU TRAVAIL (RENGAGEMENT)

Mr Morrow moved second reading of Bill 129, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act / Projet de loi 129, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Pursuant to standing order 96(c)(i), the honourable member has 10 minutes for his presentation.

**Mr Mark Morrow (Wentworth East):** As I begin, I would like to recognize in the members' east gallery Joan and Karl Crevar. They are with the Ontario Injured Workers' Group, and without their help and guidance this bill would not have been possible.

I rise today to speak to my private member's bill, Bill 129, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act.

Each and every member of this House knows that their respective constituency offices start receiving calls from injured workers the day after they are elected. In my office, at least one third of my staff time is devoted to trying to assist workers through the maze that is the Workers' Compensation Board. This is not a reflection on this government but a problem that transcends all political parties.

As a union steward, I watched the Tories, with the Weiler report, make some changes, but they just didn't go far enough. Then along came the Liberals, introducing FEL, future economic loss, and like that, that just didn't go far enough. As a matter of fact, in a lot of cases it made matters worse.

I also see the daily criticism from the other side of the House. Most of the talk is about the administrative dealings with the board, but I hear very little when it comes to support for injured workers in Ontario. It is now time to introduce legislation that really helps workers after they are injured and make sure that employers take responsibility for rehabilitation seriously.

Too often, I see in my constituency office employers who meet the bare minimum of recall rates under the Workers' Compensation Board and then quietly lay off their still-recovering staff. It reminds me, in this Easter season, of another person who just washes his hands and thinks the problem disappears.

I want to outline the major changes to the act that are included in Bill 129 and how they help injured workers.

The changing of clause 43(3)(b) takes away a lot of the discretion used in the allocation of FEL awards.

Presently the Workers' Compensation Board can decide that a worker might be able to get a job that pays a certain wage and then makes a decision on economic loss. In reality, a position may not exist or may not be available to the injured worker. So if she tries to find work in this designated area, she just gets frustrated. She is then forced to live on a reduced amount of money. The board has used this in specific cases to say that a worker has the capacity to do a minimum-wage job, and the present legislation allows for allocation of these earnings that ultimately reduce her FEL. How can an injured worker survive on money she might be able to get but can't really? Either way, she ends up with nothing.

My new section will make sure that a job is available and suitable. It is critical that the worker have the real opportunity, not just a perceived chance, to get the type of work defined as suitable and available. Too often, employers are treating their employees as just a figure on a balance sheet, to be manipulated at their benefit. This is a more common occurrence when dealing with the injured employee.

My constituency office sees employers offering inappropriate jobs or use of questionable job descriptions just to meet the re-employment rights of the Workers' Compensation Act, then watches as the worker fails to meet the requirements of the job. The employer terminates the worker at the company's earliest convenience. I am tired, actually very sick and tired, of certain businesses being responsible for the injuring of their staff and then having no responsibility when the worker tries to return to work.

Constituents in Wentworth East tell me that the re-employment process is unfair, too long to resolve and unduly harsh. In a recent memo from the Industrial Accident Victims Group of Ontario, it described a huge increase in the requests for hearings in the re-employment branch, which has caused a major backlog. Cracks are continually showing up. Attempts are being made to find a way to mediate before it gets to the hearing stage.

In a presentation by a staff person of the accident victims group of Ontario to workers' advocates, it was reported that approximately 70% of these cases are being heard and allowed in whole or in part. This is just another example of how the present system must be adapted to deal with the realities of today. If the decisions are coming back in favour of the worker, it shows that employers are either not understanding what responsibilities they have as far as re-employment rights are concerned, or legislative changes are needed to clarify the position of both parties when injured workers return to work. I believe Bill 129 helps extremely in this area.

When the injured worker goes to his doctor after complaining about the conditions and the strain on the



injured part of the body, it is a long and involved process to reinstate benefits. In many cases the board forces the worker into appealing through the decision review specialist and into the hearings branch to get a decision. This, besides leaving the worker with few financial resources, increases the strain on the administrative procedures of the board. Besides that, it further increases the strain on the social services system to react to the dumping of people who really should be the responsibility of the Workers' Compensation Board.

I think that staff time is being wasted preparing appeals that could be remedied by this change in legislation. This has also been held true by the office of the worker adviser. I've talked to Mike Grimaldi and Don Drury in the Hamilton office, and they tell me this is an ongoing occurrence. I also had a chat late yesterday afternoon with Tony Valletta from Local 1005, and he tells me that in most of his workers' comp cases, this is extremely true.

One large employer seems to be pressuring injured workers into accepting an early retirement package, using plant layoffs as a threat, at which point the Workers' Compensation Board will terminate FEL benefits, as the worker voluntarily left the workforce to take the retirement package. If the worker does not take what is offered, the employer holds the layoff threat over his head, and if he doesn't take the package, he will be left with nothing, getting caught between the proverbial rock and a hard place, leaving the injured worker with no real option. This is undue manipulation by the employer, using the employee, again, as always, as a pawn. This is not taking any type of employer responsibility for your injured employee, but more an attempt to control the bottom line. I understand business is undergoing radical change from a manufacturing to a service-based economy, but that does not mean companies can cast out injured workers in the name of progress.

The present economic condition makes it difficult for workers to push for health and safety in small firms and retain their jobs. One worker complained that a machine was unsafe. The employer threatened layoff. The worker was injured. Then when he tried to return to work, the employer used every available loophole to make sure a job was not there.

In amending subsection 54(10), I'm giving the injured employee a fairer chance to get back into the workforce.

1010

The board loves to use the phrase "work-hardening" when trying to help the workers return to their jobs. The board hopes that by working a few hours a day and then increasing the hours little by little, eventually the body will heal itself or the worker will be able to cope with the ongoing pain. What happens in a lot of cases is the worker tries the program, and with a few fits and starts, a lot of visits to the doctor thrown into the mix, he is just stuck coping with the ongoing pain. The employer then waits till the six-month requirement in the legislation is up and fills out a layoff notice.

Bill 129 gives the worker a longer time to work-harden. The injured worker will have more time to wean himself back into the job and not have a time frame

hanging over his or her head. This will also force the employer to make a true effort to assist the worker. If you must keep this employee, then you will make sure he or she can accomplish the job given, or you will retrain the worker in a job he or she can do this time, and the layoff threat that hangs over the injured worker is withdrawn.

Rehabilitation of injured employees must be a priority. The people of Ontario want to work. I propose that rehabilitation should be a right, not a maybe. Furthermore, I would also like to guarantee a job to return to when the worker is deemed ready to once again be a productive employee.

Employers are going to have to take more responsibility for their injured workers than they presently do. In most cases, it is in the employer's control to prevent injuries. Now they would like to advocate further involvement by making it impossible for the injured workers to return to their place of employment. Do they hope that this worker will become someone else's problem?

It is my hope that the honourable members of this House will consider the proposed changes as essential in offering further protection to those who have already suffered physical and mental impairments at their place of employment. The struggle has been hard enough through the pain, doctors' visits and rehabilitation without having to know, chapter and verse, the rights of the Workers' Compensation Act.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Each party will have 15 minutes to debate Bill 129 in rotation.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** I have been involved for the past month of so in what we've called an outreach tour on workers' compensation. I've travelled to Barrie, Peterborough, Chatham, Brantford, Ottawa, Sault St Marie and Thunder Bay. I've also met with workers' compensation representatives from British Columbia, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

One of the reasons that I and my leader decided we wanted to do this was that, as the member opposite has already mentioned in his opening remarks, out of 130 MPPs in this place, I would think there is not one whose main problem in a constituency office is not related to workers' comp. It may be followed very closely by support and custody orders enforcement trying to get the deadbeat fathers to pay for their kids, but clearly workers' compensation is the number one issue, certainly in my constituency office and with the colleagues I've talked to about this.

We identified that there was a problem, that over the years there has been so much tinkering going on with the Workers' Compensation Act, with the board, a lot of political interference, political interference from the corner office, with all three parties doing the tinkering. A staff person who will, to protect him, remain nameless made the comment, "In the Workers' Compensation Board we are prepared to do whatever it is you in the Legislature want us to do, but we're not sure on a daily basis, sometimes on an hourly basis, what it is you want us to do."

There needs to be a way of setting clear guidelines for policy. We have a situation now where policy in workers' compensation can be driven by such a thing as a private member's bill. It can be driven by WCAT making a decision that all of a sudden is contrary to what somebody else interprets as the proper policy set by the board of directors of the WCB.

We have figured out that there are no fewer than nine opportunities to appeal or reappeal a decision made in the workers' compensation system, and those nine do not include MPPs, because whether or not we want to admit it, we don't have the power to make a decision with regard to workers' compensation cases. So to call us an appeal process is probably stretching the reality. But the system is extremely ill, and not just from the point of view of the financial concerns. You see, I don't think it works for anybody.

I've met injured workers. Just the other day I was on a radio show in Ottawa with an injured worker who had a burn from gas. It got inside his glove and the temperature of the gas was some 220 degrees below zero. His hand apparently looked, when he got the glove off at the hospital, like a piece of chicken that just came out of a freezer. That was in 1989. This individual has been working within the system, within the medical community, both outside and inside the board, to try to, guess what, get the hand amputated, because he determined in his own research that was ultimately the solution. He has been unable to do that and the infection has grown from his hand right up to his shoulder and now the alternative is to take off the entire arm.

These kinds of bureaucratic foulups in the workers' compensation system, because some doctor on the inside didn't agree with a doctor on the outside and then everybody circles the wagons to try to protect themselves, are actually almost countless.

The example I gave you is an extreme, perhaps, but in the hearings that I held around the province I heard injured workers coming forward with horror stories that would curl your hair. So it's not working for injured workers. I accept that. I'm sure that members opposite would agree and we could come to a consensus on that.

It's also, we heard from employers, not working for employers. The employers are outraged. They get increases. We had a fellow who came forward and said: "I haven't had an accident in my establishment in 14 years. Why did I get a 31% increase in my rates? Somebody please explain this."

Maybe what needs to be looked at is the rating system based on segment of industry. Why shouldn't a company—and supposedly they do if they get a rebate, but why shouldn't the rates be set for these companies on an individual basis based on their performance, based on occupational health and safety performance?

You'll all know that I am somewhat concerned about the status and the condition of the health and safety legislation in this province and I don't think there is a proper relationship between workers' compensation and the WWSA. I believe what you have is bipartism that is being destroyed in the name of rhetoric, I guess, and I hear some of the rhetoric of the member opposite with regard

to his bill. This bill in essence is the legal right to return to work. That is the latest thing that injured workers and the labour movement are saying they want. And yet, I heard the member say, when he talked in terms of amending subsection 10, that the worker can go back to work when the worker is deemed ready to work. Those were your words, I say to the member.

If there's one thing I heard that is a serious problem that comes out of Bill 162, it's that word "deemed" and the issue of deeming. It does not appear to be working fairly and yet you could interpret what this member, with all good intentions, has said, "that when the worker is deemed ready to return to work." Deemed by whom? Here we go with this same problem. The worker says, "I'm not ready to return to work." A doctor somewhere, who perhaps has never even met the injured worker, has never examined the injured worker—that's actually, believe it or not, what happens in this system. The family doctor says, "I understand you have a problem." Let's face it, our family doctors, we all know them personally, and they us, and they want to help, so they say: "No problem. We'll fill out the form 7, we'll get you in there and get you on compensation." Somebody in the system rejects that, either an adjudicator or later in appeal or perhaps a medical adviser—somebody rejects it.

We have medical advisers in the Workers' Compensation Board who are retired from a specialist area in medicine, who don't even have the opportunity to meet the patient, the injured worker, and yet they'll make a decision based on the file. They'll pull this file out and say: "I reject that. I don't agree with that doctor's analysis." That's what happened with this injured worker back in 1989 when he had the problem with his hand. They had a doctor look at a file and reject the medical advice. That's a critical problem.

#### 1020

One of the things that bothers me in this whole scenario is the tinkering: We have a little change here, we have a little change there. We have members of the NDP caucus who want to pander, shall we say, to the desires—legitimate desires. I don't deny their concern, and I think it needs to be looked at.

In the PLMAC report, there was reference to the fact that indeed the right to return to work is in the legislation. I think that's debatable. It's perhaps not as strong as it should be. Reference was made to the fact that if it's not strong enough, if the board is unable to enforce the intent of the bill, the wording should be changed.

But we have to go a lot further. Just coming up with one little private member's bill that's going to make an amendment here or an amendment there, with all due respect—I'm sure you're honest and sincere about what you want to do here, but we have to go a lot further. We have to look at the governance. We have to deal with the issue of whether the chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board should be somebody who's appointed by the Premier because he or she was a member of our caucus or your caucus or the third party's caucus as an MLA in this place for 10 years. Are those credentials acceptable to the people of this province? Frankly, I think they're not.



We have to look at the governance as to, who are the stakeholders? I think we make a critical mistake when we talk about workers' compensation, because we say there are two stakeholders, labour and management, that we need the bipartite approach, the two vice-chairs, all this. There are a lot more than two stakeholders in workers' compensation.

The OMA has been clamouring for a spot at the table for some time. The OMA, on the other hand, says: "It's not our job to get people back to work. It's your job. We'll just give them a couple of Aspirins and tell them to call us in the morning." The OMA is prepared to come to the table and be more involved.

The chiropractic association is key. The whole thing we should be doing here is trying (a) to prevent injuries and (b), once they occur, to get them into treatment as quickly as possible. The facts show that if you start the treatment early, you'll get them back to work quicker.

I want to leave some time for my colleague from Oriole. I say to the member opposite that I regret I can't support your bill right now, because I think it is tinkering. It's an inappropriate sense of timing that comes along and says, "We're going to fix this little thing here," and send another new message out to all the staff in the field about how they interpret things.

We need to reform workers' compensation from A to Z, from governance to service delivery, from the chairman to the adjudicator, at the front door—the whole system. We need to make changes to help the injured workers and to ensure that Justice Meredith's principles that were set forth in 1914 in creating a system that was good for workers and employers will survive the turn of this century and lead on to be a benefit to injured workers in the province of Ontario.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** It is interesting that today, the day this bill is debated in this place for second reading, there are reports that the government intends to announce the commission of a royal commission to explore the creation of a universal system of coverage for everyone in this province, and the prediction that changes to the overall WCB legislation will be proceeded with as early as next week.

I congratulate the member for Wentworth East on raising the topic of WCB, because he's right. This topic is dealt with by all members in this House in our constituency offices perhaps more than any other topic. There are many workers who come to us who can't understand the system; many of us don't understand the system. It's become an inequitable, unfair system, and employers and employees both complain about the workings of the system and whether it will work.

The member for Mississauga West has used the word "tinkering" with respect to this bill, and he's right. It is dotting here and there on a couple of places. It seems to me that the bill deals with two things.

It's a very short bill. It has a total of five sections, and the main sections are dealt with in the first three or four sections. Although it's small in length, I believe it's a powerful and dangerous adjustment to the Workers' Compensation Act. My reading of this bill, to the mem-

ber for Wentworth East, is that it appears to be designed to give the Workers' Compensation Board more powers. It attempts to plug the hole opened by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Tribunal by enshrining overtly oppressive administration by the Workers' Compensation Board in law. The second thing I would submit to the member is that it's designed to ensure overcompensation.

Having said that, I'm sure the member for Wentworth East has come to this place saying these principles he's putting forward are justified on the premise that no amount of money can overturn the devastation caused by the accident, no matter how minor the injury. I'm sure that's one of the reasons he's bringing this bill forward, but I would submit that the bill has less to do with inequities in the workers' compensation system than it does with ensuring systemic overcompensation and guaranteed employment.

The real problem is that the system isn't working. The member for Mississauga West is right: What we need is an overhaul of the system. When we're all standing up in this place and talking about how the system is not working, why are we just tinkering with it, to use the words of the member for Mississauga West.

There's an excellent article I'm sure many of you have read, and if you haven't, I'd recommend that you read it. It was published over a year ago in a periodical called *Canadian Business*. It's dealing with workers' compensation across this country. I'd recommend that the member for Wentworth East read this article, and I would recommend that the members of this House read this article if the government is serious, as it is, with respect to the announcements in the media this morning that we're talking about the possibility of the creation of a universal compensation system to cover everyone in the province. I'll tell you, this system now is really in deep, deep trouble.

The unfunded liability: Is the system going to collapse? It's being predicted that it will. You could look at the history of all three parties in this House, all three governments over the past decade. During the five years of the Conservative rule from 1980 to 1985, the board went from an unfunded liability of \$800 million to \$5.5 billion; during the next five years, with the Liberal government in office, the total rose to \$9.1 billion; and since the New Democratic Party took office in 1990, the unfunded liability is somewhere between \$11 billion and \$12 billion. That's a lot of money for unfunded liability. Will the system shrink?

1030

I look at what this bill does. The member has been speaking in very general terminology, and I've been trying to determine the technicalities of it. It is difficult to explain the issue of deeming and to explain the issue of overcompensation. I have worked out principles of compensation, which probably—in the time allowed, it's almost impossible to emphasize that, but I believe there will be overcompensation, compensation that the employer simply can't afford to pay.

This bill is anti-business. We are having in this province a great number of problems trying to create jobs. The government stands up daily saying how Jobs

Ontario is solving all the problems in this province with respect to employment, and of course we on this side say it's not. The fact is that we have a lot of serious problems with respect to work. People are going bankrupt. People are leaving the province. One of the things they're afraid of is issues such as this, which the member for Wentworth East is raising. It's adding on another expense to the employer. I know he's going to talk about the worker who has had devastating injuries, but there comes a point in time when the employer only has so much money to pay.

This article I have referred to, and I'd like to quote from a couple of passages in the brief time I have, talks about the principle of universal coverage, which I believe the government is heading towards. "Some see a cure-all in so-called universal or 24-hour coverage, a concept so vague no one seems sure what it means. Labour champions the idea because, in theory, a universal system could compensate everyone for pretty well everything, regardless of what caused the problem. 'We're wasting enormous resources debating causation,' argues Cathy Walker, national health and safety director for the Canadian Auto Workers union in Toronto." It talks about how that system hasn't worked in such places as New Zealand, and some time is spent saying that system won't work.

I'm afraid about what the member for Wentworth East is doing. I'm afraid of the reports I've been reading in the media today about the possible expansion in the anti-business philosophy that continues to come forward from a government that's trying to create jobs.

Looking specifically at the bill—and again the problem is one of time; I have roughly a few minutes to speak further on it—section 2 of the bill deals with the provision of rehabilitation services to disabled workers. This, I submit, eliminates any discretion the Workers' Compensation Board may have in the determination of a rehabilitation plan. The professional opinion of the board's rehabilitation experts therefore can be easily undermined. In addition, the proposed subsection 52(2) ensures that rehabilitation is a right. This means that the board cannot refuse a rehabilitation plan even if that plan will not result in a return to employment for the worker.

Section 3 of the bill deals with the employment provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act and serves to beef up the powers of the board and make the law even more draconian.

In the current law, the re-employment provisions are an effort to ensure that a worker is not discriminated against because of a compensable injury. Under the current law, an employer has an obligation to provide a worker his pre-injury job, or suitable employment if he cannot perform his pre-injury job. There are two thresholds that must be met. First, the employer must employ more than 20 workers. Second, the worker must have been continuously employed for more than a year. Right now, though, the Workers' Compensation Board, I would submit, is abusing its powers under the re-employment provisions of the act. Bill 129, I submit, beefs up the board's powers even more.

The proposed subsection 54(1.1) is even more devastat-

ing. Right now, people would have to be employed continuously for more than a year before the obligations are activated. Bill 129 indicates that employment would be "continuous if, during the period of employment, no intention to permanently sever the employment relationship exists."

The member for Mississauga West got into the deeming provision, a provision I think we need considerably more time on, certainly more time than the three minutes I have to speak. All of this means that a worker who would be laid off for reasons completely unconnected to his compensable injury, would have a right to his employment simply because he happened to have a compensable injury.

Subsection 54(3) is amended to not allow the employer to terminate the worker before receiving notice from the board. The board will provide notice under the terms of section 54 only if and when the worker is able to return to employment. Even then, rarely does the board provide notice in a timely fashion. This means that the employer must maintain a relationship with the unsuitable employee or the employee who would be terminated or laid off in the normal course. This, I would submit to the member for Wentworth East, is simply unworkable.

The bill proposes to amend subsection 54(10) to require just-cause dismissal as the only excuse for terminating a worker. I say this simply will not work.

Immediately before the last election, literally days before the 1990 election, Bob Rae committed an NDP government to eliminating deeming in a letter to a worker group. The idea of deeming captures an image of the WCB at its worst, setting compensation on phantom jobs, ensuring that the disabled workers are left in poverty. The image, I say to the member for Wentworth East, is pure theatrics.

I hope the members of this House spend some time considering the implications of this bill, which at first blush—and I've spoken to the member privately—seem to be just minor changes. It's going to have some devastating effects on the employers of this province.

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** That's a typical Conservative response.

**Mr Tilson:** It's not a typical response; it's a response that if you're trying to create jobs in this province, listen to the people who are paying the bills. There's only so much money, as you people have found out since 1990. You've put this government into bankruptcy. There's only so much money in government and there's only so much money in the workplace. I would encourage members of this House to vote against this bill.

1040

**Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold):** I suppose it will come as no surprise to you to be told that I support this bill. I think it is a timely and remarkably precise, indeed pithy, response to some very serious problems that are being encountered right here and now.

Remarkably, once again, it's in private members' business here on Thursday morning, during this two-hour period, occurring only once a week, that we've had some of the most interesting and engaging and least partisan



debate this House ever sees. Indeed, I've never seen so many people in this chamber listening carefully to what the opposing views are, obviously weighing and considering those opposing views to the goal or the end of achieving a resolution to the issue.

I too read the Toronto Star this morning and, by God, it's almost like being in cabinet. You don't have to be there; you've just got to pick up the Star every morning. I tell you, I am looking forward to a royal commission on workers' compensation, and I am hopeful and optimistic that it will be a wide-ranging debate, that it will accommodate submissions from all sectors of the community.

I am trusting, of course, that injured workers will have status at the commission, because I think it's essential that they be represented, not just by way of one or two witnesses in the course of an afternoon or a morning but that they have an integral role in assisting the commission in cross-examining and in developing various theories through that process. I agree entirely with what's been said by every other speaker here this morning.

I know there are a whole lot of people from the government benches who want to speak to this bill. I know the parliamentary assistant will want to. I'm trusting that the parliamentary assistant will contain his or her comments so that other members, we mere back-benchers, have a chance to engage in this debate. Because I agree. Claudette Therrien in my constituency office, like her counterpart in 129 other constituency offices, devotes her full workweek to dealing with workers' compensation problems and she doesn't have the time to deal with all the files that are brought into that office.

Similarly, the office of the worker adviser, with incredible backloads, struggles very skilfully on a daily basis with the plethora of difficulties and problems generated by the system as it exists now.

People like Don Comi and Leslie Penwarden from the injured workers' group in Niagara, again, are more than familiar with the never-ending series of serious difficulties, significant difficulties, suffered by injured workers in addition to their initial injury.

One of the things I should mention is that it boggles the mind to think that there are still so-called consultants out there charging money to injured workers for services, mind you, that are being provided by constituency offices of MPPs, by injured workers' groups, by the office of the worker adviser. These are all provided free, so it boggles the mind how these so-called consultants can be out there shafting and skimming the top off of any awards that they occasionally get. But that's not the issue.

The fact is that a royal commission will investigate fully and completely all issues surrounding workers' compensation. Fine and good. The fact is that this shouldn't be a speedy process. If it's going to be done well, if it's going to be done properly, it's going to be done over a significant period of time to ensure that every single representation that could be made will be made, and there has to be a sufficient time for debate and for the preparation of a final report.

Well, what happens to the victims of an inadequate system in the interim? I've heard members this morning

speak about this bill as being mere tinkering. I dispute that. Mr Morrow, the member for Wentworth East, has approached some very specific problems and generated a response to some very specific problems, a very effective response, one that can in the interim protect injured workers in these two very specific areas.

The first is the issue of re-employment and ensuring that the right to re-employment becomes a genuine, bona fide right as compared to something the high-priced lawyers and their ilk can weave their way in and about and through, in the process shafting once again the injured worker where it's a right without a remedy. You have a right to re-employment but you don't have to be re-employed, because the employer can buy his or her way out of it in relatively short order at a relatively cheap price.

Number two is the right to rehabilitation. What could be more fundamental in response to somebody who gives his health, his lifetime, to a workplace than the right to be rehabilitated, the right to be cured as much as medical science can cure you? What could be more fundamental? How could anybody find any objection to this very simple statement of the right to rehabilitation? Once again, tinkering? No. We're not dotting i's and crossing t's here.

I remember the fight over Bill 162. I was a boy, I was in the back benches then, I was way over on the other side, as far back as the leader of my party could put me. I remember the struggle that my friend Shelley Martel, the member for Sudbury East, led over Bill 162. Both of the issues that Mr Morrow, the member for Wentworth East, addresses in Bill 129 are among the many issues that Shelley Martel, as our critic in response to Bill 162, raised during that very dramatic debate when we sat as opposition members.

I tell you that an overhaul may well be in order, but are we going to tell the injured workers of this province that they have to wait yet another six months, a year, two years before the completion of a report by the royal commission that in itself is merely a report, which then begs legislation that will result in again, I'm sure, incredible debate? Clearly, there are diverse views about the rights of workers as compared to the rights of employers. There are some here who would see them as mutually exclusive. I don't, because I think a healthy workforce, a workforce that's whole, women and men who don't lose their limbs or their eyesight or their hearing or their backs to the workplace, is as much a benefit to the whole process of manufacturing and creating wealth as anything else.

This bill, because of those two very specific issues that it confronts, two serious omissions from Bill 162, warrants speedy passage and referral to a committee so that—again, we have such a limited amount of time here—members like Mr Tilson can express the views of their constituents and of that constituency that they would speak for here in this assembly, but more importantly, so that injured workers and their sisters and brothers in the workplace could comment on this legislation and indeed have the opportunity to convince all members of this assembly that this legislation is timely, is appropriate and,

most importantly, is just. It has to do with justice and fairness. How could this assembly ever deny justice and fairness to any constituency? I say it's time to give justice and fairness to injured workers.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Orlino):** I'm pleased to rise and participate in this debate. I think anyone who's familiar with the workings of the Workers' Compensation Board will agree that there is a definite need for reform, that there are urgent problems which must be dealt with and that the Workers' Compensation Board today is not serving the needs of injured workers or the employers who depend upon the WCB.

We know that the original goals of 1914 are not being achieved today in 1994. The Workers' Compensation Board is out of touch and out of money, and frankly we're out of time. The reform is urgently needed. The bill that's before us today, Bill 129, in my view is not about fixing the problems of the WCB; it is merely tinkering, it is pandering and it is premature.

In the reading of the legislation, as I see it, this is not about workers' rights to rehabilitation. That is already included in the legislation that exists. This is about the right to return to work, and there are a few very important questions that have to be answered before this kind of legislation could be enacted.

It seems to me that while re-employment is ultimately the goal for all injured workers who are able, the concerns must be dealt with within the work environment, because presently you have a situation where when a worker is injured and they leave the workforce and there is a collective agreement in place, there is no acceptance or understanding as to what will happen regarding seniority and the return to work and perhaps the individual who has filled that slot in that spot.

This is a question which the member for Mississauga West has asked. We are very concerned about that. We believe that must be dealt with and responded to. In my view, the collective agreement is a place where that should be considered. Therefore, until that question is answered, we will end up with disputes between workers on the work site and chaos could well be the result.

1050

It seems to me that reform for the Workers' Compensation Board is much too important for us at this time to be just tinkering with certain elements of the rights of injured workers or the rights of employers.

What we need is comprehensive reform. It is long overdue and I believe that this bill not only does not fix it; it might well exacerbate a difficult situation and does not deal with the problem.

Just as a matter of proving how out of touch the WCB is, I received a letter from the chair's office addressed to myself as Minister of Health. By the way, this was dated in March 1994. If you ever wanted an example of the problems at the WCB, this is it.

**The Acting Speaker:** Unfortunately, the member's time has expired. Further debate?

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** Very briefly, I just want to say that after reading the articles today in the paper, the WCB commission being looked at, I think

it's long overdue. It's been long overdue and I would hope that when the government does look at this WCB, it will take into consideration the faults that have been there for a long time.

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** I'd like to congratulate my colleague for bringing this issue forward because the issue of the Workers' Compensation Act reform is foremost in a lot of people's mind, and it's about time the government started addressing the plight of the injured workers.

I know that locally in my area I've been working with the Kitchener-Waterloo and Cambridge injured workers' group which has just put out a booklet that it's distributing to the unions and the labour council that'll help injured workers through the process. It's a fairly complicated process and injured workers have gone through this process. So to help out their fellow injured workers in the riding, they've put out this booklet that'll help new injured workers.

This is one of the reasons why the government has committed so much money to the injured workers' groups across the province, and this is one of the ways they're using it to help in the education.

Right now we have a set of recommendations from the Premier's Labour-Management Advisory Committee which addresses the immediate pressures facing the system, a need to undertake a long-term, broadly based study to determine the most appropriate income support system for our times.

The government has been very encouraged by the progress that labour and business have been able to make in this very difficult area. The PLMAC proposal has many elements the government wants to consider carefully. Labour and business have asked that government turn its mind to the recommendations forthwith and that is what we are doing.

As everyone knows, the PLMAC was established in June 1992, following first reading of Bill 40. Its composition includes prominent leaders of labour and management in the province. This committee is chaired by the Premier.

In May 1993, the Premier asked the PLMAC to explore its willingness to take a lead role in addressing WCB reform issues. At its meeting on March 4 and 5, the PLMAC reached an agreement on the reform package, and on March 10, 1994, the PLMAC met with the Premier and the Minister of Labour and presented its package of reforms.

This package includes recommendations on governance, financial accountability, framework, measures to improve the financial situation of the system, measures to improve return to work, old-act workers, the need of a long-term review of the system.

These PLMAC recommendations will be reviewed by cabinet in the very near future and it's my understanding that an announcement will be made. I'd like to state that the consensus proposal put forward through the PLMAC is very encouraging. Once again, I'd like to thank the member for keeping this issue alive and I'm sure that in compendium with what the PLMAC and the Ministry of



Labour are doing, this could be worked in very well.

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** I'd like to begin by congratulating the member for Wentworth East on the introduction of this bill, Bill 129. We know that there are some problems with workers' compensation, and I think this is a first attempt to do something about it.

The member for Oriole made comments, something about tinkering or pandering. Well, I certainly disagree. I think it's a big step in the right direction. You can't make sweeping changes all at once and I think the member for Wentworth East's attempt to make these changes are very commendable.

His bill actually does two things: It makes rehabilitation a right and it also closes loopholes that may exist in terms of re-employment. These are two very serious problems that many workers have faced over the years. With my involvement with CUPE over the years, I've had a considerable amount of dealings with the Workers' Compensation Board and these are certainly two areas that consumed a lot of my time. I again would like to congratulate the member on bringing this forward.

I just received a note that there are other members who want to speak on this bill. Time is very short, so I will concede to my members.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Thank you to the speaker who just spoke. I appreciate the time.

Very quickly, I want to thank the author of this bill because I think it's worthwhile. I think we need to do this sort of thing. I am going to support the bill; there's no question about it.

For those who say, however, that the author is tinkering, I want to remind people about the process in this place and how the author's, in this case Mark Morrow's, hands are tied in this place when we talk about introducing bills that might have some sort of monetary component to them. Our hands are tied; we can't do that. I know that Mark, if his hands were untied, would introduce things like pension reforms in this bill. I know that would be included. So for those who talk about tinkering and for those who say that we should be doing other things, that we should be including other aspects to this bill, I would agree with them.

I would also agree that this should be a government initiative as well. But here is private members' hour. We're talking about a private member who has introduced Bill 129 and who has done whatever he can do as a private member in this place, a backbencher, remembering of course again that his hands are tied and that he can't, as a private member, introduce things like pension reforms, something that I very quickly want to talk about because I was hoping that pension reforms might be a component tied into this. But it can't be, obviously. Pension reforms are very important to me.

The people whose hands are tied out there as well because of their injuries, who can't go back to work, are very important as well. This bill addresses those people, those people who can't go back to work even though they want to go back to work after an injury. As to the people who want to be rehabilitated and to go back to work at the same time, this bill addresses them. We need to

understand the backbencher who has introduced this and how his hands are tied as well in this place.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired, thank you. Now the member for Wentworth East has two minutes to reply.

**Mr Morrow:** I want to thank all the members, first of all, who spoke, either in support of or against this bill. It's interesting to note that I think every speaker who spoke said there had to be an overhaul of or changes to the Workers' Compensation Board. You're right, and that's what Bill 129 is about: changes.

In 1914, in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, we introduced the Workmen's Compensation Act; I believe it was passed into law in 1917. That act was to help the injured workers in the province of Ontario. That act is now failing. Bill 129 tries to help that.

To the member for Dufferin-Peel, you go out and tell the injured workers, "There is no more money." You tell them; they want to hear you say that. To the other members, I appreciate your support.

I look forward to this bill passing. I look forward to helping the injured workers in this province, once again with what they justly deserve, not with the mere pittance we're giving them now but with something they've worked for and have a right to.

**The Acting Speaker:** The time for ballot item 43 has expired. A vote will take place at noon.

1100

#### WATER EXTRACTION AGREEMENTS ACT, 1993

##### LOI DE 1993 SUR LES ENTENTES PORTANT SUR L'EXTRACTION D'EAU

Mr Elston moved second reading of Bill 126, An Act respecting Water Extraction Agreements / Projet de loi 126, Loi concernant les ententes portant sur l'extraction d'eau.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Pursuant to standing order 96(c)(i), the member has 10 minutes for his presentation.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I am very, very pleased to rise in the House today to speak about this particular issue. It's an extremely important and critical issue to our lives.

I was raised on a farm in Morris township, Huron county, raised next to the Maitland River, swam in that river, skated on it in the wintertime, drank water from a dug well. You could have as much water as you wanted when I was a kid, and I think in many cases that's still the feeling of all the people in the province of Ontario.

Water in my view is the most precious of the resources which we all have. We know we need air and we need water to continue to live. In fact, one of the things that has come to my attention very clearly is that while we have taken some interest, and I think a serious interest, in air quality, and in water quality on the surface streams in our province, we haven't put our minds to the issue of water underground.

It's a very, very serious problem for those of us who have had local issues that have been raised to us by constituents who are concerned about the taking of water

by people who come into the communities, who basically drive in one day, start taking water from a well and then ship it out to places unknown.

In my case, the issue that really sparked my final move towards doing something about water was the water-taking in the village of Formosa. Certainly I am eternally grateful to the local citizens of Formosa for finally pushing me to actually do something in a legislative format to raise the interest of the public in the conservation of water as a resource.

The people there are concerned, like we are right across the province, that there be a long-term future for us. We must as a result know exactly what is going on with our water in this province. To this point in time, there really is no understanding of how water is generated, how much is generated, how quickly it can be regenerated, what the activities that we carry on are doing to that water-generation ability. It seems to me it is time that we began to understand much more thoroughly the nature of this water resource of ours.

My bill is an interesting one, because it is just another bill, I guess some might say, in a list of about 40 that exist which deal with water in the province, but none of those other bills, with the exception of one that was recently passed, even really talk about the taking of water in the way that mine does.

There is a water-taking permit that is required under the Ontario Water Resources Act. It's administered by the Ministry of Environment and Energy. For those people who take more than 50,000 litres of water a day, they must have a permit. There is a procedure by which an application is made, and to this point in time, basically very little has been allowed in terms of public participation. It's not because it wasn't really wanted, I don't think; I think it was mostly an oversight by the authorities. In fact, the application itself could accommodate some public hearings, but I'm told by the London regional office that no public meeting has ever been called under the auspices of the current permit-issuing facilities.

There is another provision now that is just working its way through the legislative framework. It has been passed as part of the Environmental Bill of Rights, which does require some more public participation when it deals with water, but it is interesting that when dealing with the Environmental Bill of Rights, those provisions look like they may have been added on.

The environmental bills of rights that have come, in various stages and formats, before the Legislature since I've been a member have basically accommodated the issue of toxic contamination, either of our water through dumping or of leachate coming from municipal or illegal dump sites in our province, and the bill of rights has always been designed, it seems to me, to deal with that issue of disposition of garbage in one form or another. But the taking of water, which is an extremely essential part of our everyday lives, has really gone unaddressed. I think it's not because people don't have any interest in it, but it's because, like so many other of our resources that were for years and years found in abundance all across the province in a state ready to use and taken for

granted, water is taken for granted along those same lines.

The framework for my legislation, and I expect and I've heard that there is going to be general support for the bill as it resides in this form at this moment, says that the best way to deal with the issue of how the locality is to be affected by giving a water permit is to be determined locally.

For some people that is a problem, and I appreciate the member for Dufferin-Peel has come to me and asked me some questions about, "Why go to the local authority?" I think he feels perhaps it might be a little bit better if you supported the provincial central control of this. Well, my answer is very, very simple indeed: It is that the local municipality can respond almost instantaneously to the questions about what is taking place in its own backyard.

In fact, I want the local municipality to be intimately involved, not only in the application but in receiving the studies that they believe are necessary to satisfy themselves as the local political authority, and their ratepayers, their residents, that the operation of water-taking will not diminish the ability of the communities to sustain themselves. That's the first issue.

The second issue is the local municipality can probably do it cheaper than what it can be done for by the province. We know that there is a tremendous financial burden now on the provincial authorities. We know that if there is one more job added to the provincial public service, there probably will be no more people added to take care of the issue as it develops.

In my view, the quick nature of response which was achieved by the people in Carrick and Culross when concerns were raised by the citizens was ample evidence that a lot more in-depth work can be done quicker and cheaper at the local level because that concern is driven by a personal and continuing interest in residing in that area.

For those people who are concerned that this may be a type of anti-business piece of legislation, I want to assure them that I have taken great steps in trying to circulate this material to those people who would be affected. I haven't just sent this bill around to people who might support it; I have sent it to the association of water-taking businesses, I have sent it to the local municipalities, I have sent it to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture representatives in my area, I've sent it to municipalities and I've sent it to the people who were concerned in my area about water-taking.

I have received replies back from almost all of those people, but the one reply which is of concern to me is that there is a suggestion by the people representing the water-taking industry that this is against jobs. I appreciate they may be concerned that there will be an increasing burden, responsibility even, on the businesses that propose to take the water, of meeting the local concerns. In fact, because my bill requires consideration of a levy to be taken against the volume of water taken away, I know there is also a financial responsibility which will inevitably fall upon these businesses.

But the legitimate dealers, in my view, will want to do



all of those things. They will want to have a financial responsibility to the local municipality. They will want to assure the local ratepayers and residents of the area that their intentions are not only noble but they are for the long term as opposed to, "We will take till it's done and then we'll be gone." All of these items can be addressed at the local hearings, after the permit is issued by the Ministry of Environment and Energy.

I can tell you that we are all interested in local jobs. In fact, there is an exemption under the provisions of this bill which says that if the water-taking is in volume but you actually process it inside the area, then you can be exempt, the recognition being that the local resource is generating local economic activity and jobs in the community—in the community. I think that's an important concept.

We've also provided exemptions for bulk water-taking by municipalities. For instance, in my area, Brant township actually is the host municipality for the wells for both the town of Walkerton and the town of Hanover, represented by my friend from Grey-Owen Sound. I don't want to stop the taking of water for those purposes—a legitimate purpose for the people, in my view. So from my point of view, there are reasonable limits set to the application of this act.

I ask everybody to support me. I would just draw your attention again to the material which I sent around to you, an excellent series of articles by the Owen Sound Sun Times, an excellent program last night by David Suzuki on water, not just in my area, and I would ask again for the support of the people here at the Legislature for 126.

1110

**The Acting Speaker:** Each party has up to 15 minutes to debate Bill 126 in rotation.

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound):** It is my pleasure to stand in the House today and support my good friend from Bruce county on his bill. I want to congratulate him for bringing this bill to the House. I'm really proud that he did that because in Grey county, in my home town, we also have some concerns about the water-taking, and I too believe that the local municipalities should have the right to issue permits in this case.

If you've ever lived on a farm and gone without water when the well's either gone dry or your pipes are frozen and you have livestock to look after, you'll know how important the water is. If we don't get some control of the water-taking, then this could happen in different municipalities within my riding and in Bruce.

I think in Grey and Bruce we probably have the best water there is in Ontario and we know that a lot of other people are looking at us to supply them with water. There's even talk of a great pipeline coming right from Georgian Bay to pipe the water to Toronto, and it's just because we have the water up there that's pure; as I said, the best water there is in the world. We can eat our fish when we go fishing in Georgian Bay. We have some of the best fishing spots there are, and you can eat our fish because our water is good.

There's the other thing: Should the local people have

the right to decide? I think they do. I got elected on local autonomy and I have some concerns about other things that Queen's Park likes to control. I think the local municipality should have the right to at least have some say into this. What happens now is that somebody can be trucking water out of a local municipality and the local politicians won't even know about it until after it's happened, and this isn't right. So I think that with Murray's bill, this will come a long way in helping us solve this problem.

The other thing in Grey county is, and we've asked—we've had meetings with the Minister of Environment and Energy and the Minister of Municipal Affairs to look into the whole situation—do we have enough water in Grey county to supply water to the rest of the people? We want to know this, and we're even looking into a point where maybe in our municipalities we would like a moratorium put on until this is proven to us.

It's ironic that some people may say Bill Murdoch's standing up here asking for more controls, because normally I would like to see fewer controls. But water is one of the most important things in life that we do need controls on and it just doesn't seem to have enough control at this point, and there are a lot of people within my riding who are concerned. One of the important things or one of the odd things that has happened is that it has brought the preservationists, the ones who want all the controls, and the local municipalities together, and they're working on this problem.

On April 9, there is a meeting in my riding, right in central Grey in Markdale. A group called the Grey Association for Better Planning is putting on a meeting, and I know that Murray Elston is one of the panelists there, just to discuss this issue. I'm sure they'll have a great crowd there because, again, it affects everyone in my riding, regardless of whether you're out in the country or living in one of the small municipalities.

So I really am glad that the member from Bruce county has brought this to the House. I hope the government of the day will see that this bill goes on and does come back for third reading. We have the summer. Hopefully they will take this bill out to a committee so that people can look at this and bring it back for third reading and pass it, because again, our local municipalities need some control. The local people where the water is should have something to say about that.

In closing, I just want to say again that I believe that in Grey and Bruce counties we do have the best water. We're not going to keep it away from you if the water is there, but we just want to know where it's going and have a bit of control.

**Mrs Irene Mathyssen (Middlesex):** As an MPP who represents a primarily rural and agricultural community and as a rural resident myself, who, along with my family, depends on well water for drinking and other water needs, I can fully appreciate the concerns regarding water extraction for bottling operations which have been brought to the attention of the honourable member for Bruce and which have prompted him to draft and present to the House the bill that we have an opportunity to debate this morning.

Water is an important, precious and essential resource. The management, conservation and pollution prevention of this resource is a major focus of the Ministry of Environment and Energy and this government.

I'd like to clarify for the House the legislation currently in place to control the extraction of water. The Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy has the sole authority under section 34 of the Ontario Water Resources Act to regulate the taking of water in excess of 50,000 litres per day through the issuance of a permit by a director.

The mandate of the permit-to-take-water program established under the auspices of the OWRA is to promote the efficient development and beneficial use of surface and groundwaters while securing against interference with other uses of water or interference with the natural environment. Any water-taking over 50,000 litres per day, other than for farm or domestic purposes, requires a permit as authorized under the Ontario Water Resources Act. A director may issue, refuse to issue or cancel a permit, may impose such terms and conditions in issuing a permit as she or he considers proper and may alter the terms and conditions of a permit after it's issued.

The Ministry of Environment and Energy is particularly concerned with the potential of groundwater and surface water interference from operations of a commercial nature. Currently, fewer than 25 permits have been issued in the province to the bottling industry. No application has been received since December 1993.

Another primary concern, in addition to interference problems, is the destruction of natural habitats surrounding springs or artesian well sources. Regional technical assessment staff review all applications under the permit-to-take-water program, including commercial takings. Applications to take water undergo a thorough hydrological review and surface water review which determine the maximum allowable volume that can be drawn and not affect the long-term sustainability of the supply.

In any area where there is insufficient water—a limited aquifer—to meet established and new uses, an evaluation of the relative importance of the various uses is carried out by MOEE regional staff before the issuance of permits. The ministry refuses to issue permits if there is a possibility of a drawdown affecting other water supplies or nearby surface water bodies.

The taking of water for domestic and farm purposes and fire protection is considered the most important use, generally followed by taking for municipal water supply, then the taking of water for industrial, commercial and irrigation purposes. Water management for pollution control, flood control, recreation and biological preservation are also important considerations in the review of permit applications and the assignment of special conditions where required.

Many permits issued from the MOEE, particularly for bottling operations, are issued conditionally. In other words, specific terms and conditions are likely to be applied, such as maintaining a metering device on each source from which water is drawn, monitoring the static water level of one or two nearby monitoring wells, and submitting to the MOEE annual records of water-takings

which list the date, time, rate and volume of water taking on a daily or weekly basis.

Once a permit is issued, the proponent is required to reapply for another permit or for an amendment if at any time there is an increase in the rate or volume of the taking or a change in ownership. Also, if an impact is noted through monitoring or if a complaint is received which shows there has been some impact, the conditions of the permit are revised or the permit is revoked. Municipalities such as Grey, Bruce and Caledon have in the recent past become concerned about bottling operations because the water often leaves the particular watershed from which it was taken without any benefit being received, financial or otherwise.

The Ministry of Environment and Energy has responded to concerns raised by municipalities and the general public over commercial water-taking by bottling companies. The current legislation does not preclude notice to municipalities and does allow flexibility to address the problems that arise. It is MOEE's practice now to notify any affected municipality of any bottling proposal received. MOEE has included operating conditions, as requested by local municipalities, conditions such as limiting the time of day for the water withdrawals or the period of time before renewal is required. Permits to bottling companies are now issued for a two-year period rather than the more typical 10-year period. In addition, MOEE staff encourage all applicants to receive the appropriate zoning and to adhere to local municipal bylaws and regulations before submitting an application to our ministry.

#### 1120

Also, as the members of this House will know, the Environmental Bill of Rights, proclaimed on February 15 of this year, gives all Ontarians a greater say in environmental decisions affecting their lives and communities. It is the intent of the MOEE to include applications under the permit-to-take-water program in the EBR registry. During the minimum 30-day notification period, the public, including municipalities, may provide written comments on these applications to the MOEE, and the ministry must consider and respond to these comments. Once a decision to issue a permit is made and placed on the Environmental Bill of Rights registry, a 15-day period is allowed for any resident to seek leave to appeal that decision, because we believe public input and participation are essential to our environmental wellbeing.

Improvements can always be made, and I hope this debate will foster some new ideas regarding how we can do things better. In principle, I support the stated intent of the honourable member's bill and support public consultation on environmental matters such as water use. However, I believe the current form of Bill 126 does not contain provisions which promote the conservation of water.

In fact, one section of the bill suggests that fees to municipalities be based on allowable amounts of water to be taken rather than the actual extraction. If the purpose of the bill is to promote the conservation of water, the fees should be based on the amount of water used, not the maximum amount indicated on the permit. That



would certainly encourage the permit holder to use the maximum amount.

On average, Canadians use 340 litres of water a day, second only to the Americans, who use 426 litres a day. The Europeans, by comparison, use about 165 litres a day. We have to use water far more wisely than we do.

The Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy is undertaking measures to promote water conservation and protect the quality of our water. These include setting strict discharge reduction limits for the petroleum refining industry and the pulp and paper industry; issuing clean water draft regulations for metal mining, metal casting and industrial minerals; and committing in excess of half a billion dollars over the next three years for Jobs Ontario funding for more than 300 water and sewer projects. We're investing \$25 million annually in Ontario's seven remedial action plans for the Great Lakes area. And we're choosing pollution prevention, the elimination of pollutants at the source, as the first method of protecting water quality.

In summary, I believe this bill is addressing the symptoms rather than the root cause of the growing demand for bottled water: the need for safe, clean water by Ontarians. Our government has already demonstrated our commitment to the development of measures that ensure that all Ontarians have a healthy, sustainable source of clean water, and we will continue our efforts to safeguard that very important resource.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** As I begin this discussion during private members' hour, I'd like to take a minute to explain to those who are watching why I think private members' hour is so important. This is an opportunity for non-partisan discussion and debate on issues which are of interest to individual members, usually of items which are not on the government's agenda and which may not be seen by the government, or in fact by individuals across the whole province, as a significant priority.

Right now in the riding of Oriole my constituents believe, as I believe, that the priority for the province of Ontario is economic renewal and job creation. People are worried: Are they going to have jobs tomorrow? They are also very concerned about the important public services that are provided by the province: health services and educational services. Are we going to be able to ensure that the opportunities are there for our youth? Youth unemployment and jobs for youth are extremely important to my constituents in the riding of Oriole.

Private members' hour gives us an opportunity to debate and to discuss and to raise issues on the public agenda which are important not only for today but for the long term as well. I believe my colleague Mr Elston should be congratulated for tabling Bill 126, the bill that is before us, because I believe it is a public interest issue. Water is a very significant natural resource in the province of Ontario. The security of our water supply, the management of our water supply, are in need not only of important debate in principle but also further discussion and the opportunity to raise the public consciousness at the resources committee of the Legislature, as this bill, hopefully, will be supported by all members of the

Legislature and then permitted to have the kind of public discussion awareness through the committee hearing process.

Private members' hour gives us the opportunity to debate this bill in principle, and that's what I intend to do today. I was provided by Mr Elston with some interesting background material. In the time I have I'd like to share some of the comments of some of those people who are as concerned about water management as I am.

There was a very timely article in the Financial Post within the last year. The headline says, "World's Fresh-water Tap in Peril." I'm just going to put on the record two paragraphs from an excellent article that I would commend to anyone who is interested in preserving and protecting water for future generations. This is the beginning of the article: "Water, like energy in the 1970s, will probably become the most critical natural resource issue facing most parts of the world by the start of the next century."

The bottom line, the last paragraph of that article, is, "However, the complexity of the problems across both the developed and developing world supports the United Nations environment program's"—UNEP is what it's called—"belief that the questions of where clean water will come from next and how much it will cost will remain high on the international agenda."

I remember some concerns and discussions about the availability and the transportation of water during the free trade discussions and debates that ensued. I don't believe those questions were ever legitimately answered.

We know that the Sun Times in Owen Sound has been investigating this issue quite thoroughly, and many of the articles Mr Elston presented to me make very important points that I don't believe the public is generally aware of. One of the articles states as follows: "Little is being done to update the provincial process for approving water-taking permits. Despite growing complaints, it's badly out of date as the water bottling industry continues to grow."

I'm going to be 50 years old this year.

*Applause.*

**Mrs Caplan:** Thanks very much. Yes, I see that as a milestone.

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** Tell us it isn't so.

**Mrs Caplan:** It is so. I'm also going to be a grandmother this year, so it's a banner year for me. It's an important and exciting time.

But I remember, and it didn't seem so long ago, when in fact there was no water bottling industry. We didn't see, except in offices, the kinds of water bottles in places where taps were not available. Now it is very common for people in their homes and in their cottages. I have a permanent part-time residence in Huntsville, Ontario. For years we drew our water from the lake and we used filtering systems. Now what we have is a water bottling system where we purchase it at our local grocery store. I think the water bottling industry is important and good for Ontario. I know the water I drink now is probably much safer than the water I drank straight from the lake

just a few years ago. I've seen how rapidly these things have changed, and I know legislation frequently gets outdated and that it is important, from time to time, to go back to our basic principles and to take a look at them.

1130

I think the points Mr Elston made in his original presentation were very important and worth considering. We have an industry and those jobs are very important to us, and we want to make sure that as we protect our water we also protect the industries that are beginning to develop and flourish. He said something I'd like to quote again. Mr Elston made the point that while there were legitimate concerns, reasonable limits were also very much acceptable to legitimate agencies' drawing and taking of water, and that it was reasonable that both responsibility and accountability should be as close as possible to the local community where the water was being taken from. The frustration that is occurring today is that local municipalities have no say whatever over what is happening within their communities. Those jobs are equally important to them, but so are the water resources in their community.

As we find the kind of balance this legislation provides by involving municipalities and giving them the ability to manage the water within their boundaries, I think there is an important role for the province, which could well establish the criteria, which could well establish the policy under the Ontario Water Resources Act or an updating of that act. It could go hand in hand with the local management and the partnership and control of the local municipalities, which frequently know best about what's happening in their jurisdiction and care very much about their community and economic development.

I believe this is an opportunity where we could rethink the way we are presently doing things. The province could be a little less paternalistic. We could hold out our hands to local municipalities, which have the same concerns, the same goals and perhaps a little bit better expertise in being able to ensure that resources are properly managed.

Water is a very important natural resource in Ontario. We have seen efforts to keep the water clean. The one thing we haven't been able to do successfully is to look at water-taking. The issue really is, who owns that water? It's my view that whether you live in Huron or Bruce or Metropolitan Toronto, each and every one of us has a stake in protecting the water resources of the province of Ontario.

The bill that is before us, Bill 126, which is called An Act respecting Water Extraction Agreements, is an important bill because it gives us the opportunity to have a full debate, to raise the public consciousness and to establish the kind of criteria and policies that will do exactly what I just referred to, which is protect our water resource not only today but for future generations.

If this government is as serious as Mrs Mathysen says it is about protecting the water resource for future generations, hopefully it will permit this bill to go to the resources committee or a committee of the Legislature, where we can raise the public consciousness, have a full and open debate and perhaps see this bill amended to

respond to whatever concerns are out there. Today is an opportunity to debate in principle, and tomorrow or the day after that or the week after that or the month after that will give us the time we need to truly study this bill and amend it and bring in the kind of forward-looking policies which will protect these resources not only for today but for the future.

I'm pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this debate. It is about the notion of not only protecting our water and our resources, but it's the notion of central control versus local partnership and local participation. As a former municipal councillor, I very much believe that municipalities should be partners in protecting our resources and that this bill provides a very good framework for proceeding to do that.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I welcome this opportunity to rise in support of private member's Bill 126, An Act respecting Water Extraction Agreements. This bill is very timely. There have been some issues raised in my riding with regard to this very issue we're discussing today.

Briefly, the member for Bruce would require a person who takes water from a water-taking site under the authority of a permit issued under section 34 of the Ontario Water Resources Act to obtain a certificate of authorization from the Minister of Environment and Energy and negotiate an agreement with the local municipality if the water is taken for shipment outside the municipality without bottling or processing.

As well, the agreement may require the permit holder to pay the local municipality an annual fee that is based on the maximum volume of water the permit holder is authorized to take under the permit. A prescribed percentage of the fee is to be paid to the Minister of Finance. Finally, agreements are not assignable, and the bill sets out recordkeeping and monitoring requirements, as well as termination provisions. This bill covers a broad area.

Concern regarding water extraction has been expressed to me by a number of my constituents on a number of occasions. Albert Swan of Elmvale wrote to me recently indicating that a local resident is considering selling water from wells in the area for export, and he is afraid it will ruin all the wells in the area. Mr Swan says: "We did not mind using the water for irrigation, as it soaked back into the soil. But hauling it away will deplete the supply, no doubt."

On February 15, the Ministry of Environment wrote to the township of Springwater indicating that the current permit for water extraction proposes withdrawal of the water for the purposes of selling bottled water. Bottling is not to occur on the site.

The ministry agreed with the township of Springwater's conclusion that this type of operation is not appropriate in an area zoned agricultural. The ministry decided to withhold the certificate until the zoning and official plan amendments are finalized to the township's satisfaction, thereby giving the jurisdiction back to the municipality.

According to the ministry, section 52 of the Ontario Water Resources Act clearly states: "No person shall



establish, alter, extend or replace new or existing water works except under and in accordance with an approval granted by the director," and "Water works" means any works for the collection, production, treatment, storage, supply and distribution of water, or any part of such works, but does not include plumbing or other works to which regulations made under clause 75(3)(a) apply."

The ministry officials concluded their letter by indicating that an approval under section 52 of the OWRA will also be required before proceeding. This will enable the establishment of quality and quantity conditions beyond what is established in the permit to take water.

I agree with Mr Swan and other residents in the Hillsdale area who are concerned that water extractions across Ontario do not have sufficient legislation or regulation. I am concerned that this lack of legislation and regulation could result in the mass extraction of water from local municipalities for shipment throughout the country or even across the border into the United States.

It's interesting to note that just on February 11, the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority passed the following resolution:

"Therefore be it resolved that the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority go on record as being opposed to the practice of such operations without local municipal input into the licensing; and

"That the province of Ontario be requested to place a moratorium on the issuing of new licences for the sale and export of water until further studies have been undertaken and more information is available...."

I am supporting this private member's bill because we should ensure that municipal and provincial levels of government are involved in the use and conservation of our water. People like Albert Swan and the numerous people on whose behalf he is writing and organizations such as the NVCA really do fear that their water supply is being depleted as a result of insufficient legislation and a lack of government action.

I commend the member for Bruce for bringing this legislation forward. It's timely, it's necessary, and it's appropriate that we have a really good discussion in this House about this very important issue. After all, water is our main resource, and it sometimes concerns me, with the dumps we're putting in rural Ontario, underground, burying garbage, about the result that's going to have on the future too. So I commend the member for bringing this forward.

1140

**Mr Cooper:** It's my pleasure to participate in the debate today, and I'd like to commend the member for bringing forward this issue, an issue that's really important to the region of Waterloo, which has been wrestling with the water issue for years.

In the stated intent of the bill, it says "to promote the conservation of water, to ensure that high quality water supplies are available to the people of Ontario, and to ensure that the Ministry of Environment and Energy and municipalities participate in regulating the extraction and transportation of water."

I'd like to remind the member that this government has set up the Ontario Clean Water Agency, whose purpose and intent is to make sure that the province of Ontario has sufficient drinking water to provide to the people here in this province, and its main focus is on conservation.

One of the problems I have with this bill is where he's talking about the municipalities participating in regulating the extraction and transportation of water. I know that at the 1993 AMO annual conference there was a resolution passed that said:

"Therefore be it resolved that AMO petition the Ministry of Environment and Energy and the Ministry of Natural Resources to provide municipalities with a means to regulate and control the removal of water for commercial purposes or for resale, and to investigate the possibility of having the water resource treated as a commodity and financially valued similar to the gravel resource, whereby a system of revenue-sharing with the local municipalities or the maintenance of the roads may be realized."

I know that in some of the articles that have come about because of the introduction of this bill, a lot of the questions that are now being asked are, exactly who does water belong to and who should have control of it? Water is one of our most precious resources and the utilization must be properly controlled for everyone in the province.

I'm concerned about the potential impact that over-taking of surface water or groundwater might have on adjacent or downstream users of water and the environment, and this is where it concerns me. We've just designated the Grand River as a heritage river now, and there were discussions with members from Bruce and Grey and all the way down to Lake Erie. So this would affect Waterloo region and I know Waterloo region has been wrestling with this issue about the future need for water. We've had discussions on a pipeline and now my understanding is that study will be delayed until 1996.

One of the things we have done is that we have put in the Mannheim recharge system, which takes the Grand River water and filters and purifies it, and now that's supplementing the groundwater we have. The other thing is that we have the Groundwater Research Institute from the University of Waterloo, which has been going across the riding trying to find out exactly how much they have, and now it's my understanding that the region of Waterloo has commissioned them to actually take an inventory of the water.

If people are taking it for commercial use, it may impact on other municipalities that are a fair way away, so it's good that we have this discussion. We have to determine whether or not it should be allowed, basically through the province as a whole, to determine what water use should be and make sure that we do have clean drinking water for everybody in the province.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** On all of these issues that are being raised in this House today on the subject of water, certainly we all agree with them. Water is becoming more and more of a great concern to all of us, not only in this province but around the world. We're concerned about pollution, we're concerned about the loss of water and certainly we are concerned about the

regulation of water trucking. For that reason, I congratulate the member for Bruce in bringing this issue to this House for debate at this time.

I must say, though, that I cannot support the principle of what he is doing specifically with the regulation of the water trucking industry by the municipalities. I say that because water is a provincial resource. It goes beyond the boundaries of municipalities, whether you're talking rivers, whether you're talking lakes or whether you're talking aquifers. The aquifers extend the boundaries, and it's going to be with a great deal of difficulty that municipalities, through the agreements with these industries, these corporations and others, will be able to properly regulate it.

It's tempting for me to remind the member for Bruce of the Liberal Sunday shopping legislation in which it was suggested that Sunday shopping be regulated by the municipalities. There was a great fear that was put forward by all around this province that we would have different rules for Sunday shopping throughout the province and that it would be unfair to different individuals. That same fear exists here, that we'll have different rules, different sets of royalties that will be set by different municipalities.

I would also submit that this legislation probably doesn't go far enough. There's the topic of golf courses. We all have heard of how the watering of the greens on golf courses is creating many problems with respect to wells surrounding golf courses. It doesn't seem to deal with other industries, whether it be breweries, whether it be agricultural, the transport of water for agriculture and other commercial activities. So there is a certain amount of discrimination with respect to this topic.

But that's not to say this place shouldn't deal with it. The Ontario Water Resources Act, as I understand it, hasn't been amended in some 30 years. Currently, if you want to draw water, you have to get a permit from the government, yet the regulation as to how much water comes out of the ground, whether it be from a well or from an aquifer, is on the honour system. The individuals pulling the water out mark in their own logs and report it. It's a very inefficient system that we have concerning the fear we have.

There's also the subject of who owns the water, and that's a legal issue. The member for Bruce has indicated in his presentation that he has spent considerable time researching this. I understand he had a law student spend some time researching the topic. But it's a topic that needs to be reviewed further, the topic of whether the private owners own it or whether the crown owns it. That's a topic that I hope would be proceeded with before this type of legislation proceeds.

Can the province pass some of this jurisdiction on to the municipalities? Probably they can, but the question is whether they should. I emphasize that there should be a consistent policy throughout the province. Different agreements, different royalties, will lead to unfair advantages with the commercial world. A piecemeal approach, which I submit this bill is putting forward, is wrong. Not only would there be another layer of bureaucracy, but there would be confusion throughout the province and the

people who are using the water, and it's not just the water takers, it's the golf courses, it's the others that overlap into other jurisdictions.

I emphasize that water is a provincial resource—it isn't a municipal resource—and accordingly should be regulated by the province. As I said, currently the province issues permits for the extraction of water, and the law is out of date. I would hope that, if anything, the introduction of this bill and this debate in this place today would encourage the government to consider great changes to the water resources act and other pieces of legislation that regulate the topic that is before us.

I would submit that for all these reasons I have given, the municipalities not have the jurisdiction to do what this law is doing. I submit that they may not be able to do it. They may not have the financial resources to do it.

On the topic of the royalties, the member has referred to a section in his bill, section 11, which talks about a certain percentage of the royalties going to Queen's Park, to the provincial government. Well, I'll tell you, the record of the provincial government is not good, and if the municipalities are going to have to be retaining staff, whether it be legal staff or environmental staff, they have to pay for all this, they have to pay for all the inspections, and they're going to need a great deal of resources to properly administer it.

I would submit that only the provincial government has those resources, and all these royalties they're going to be taking will simply be taken by the province, so I would submit that this legislation not be proceeded with at this time.

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** I stand here today and I commend my colleague for Bruce in bringing forth this private member's Bill 126. A number of people have phoned me in my constituency, because it does affect us, and they're concerned. Any time we talk here in this House about water and the issues around that as a commodity is very much needed.

The bill goes a long way to help the issues around making sure municipalities have an opportunity to recover costs. That is knowing that my roads need to be paved and my roads need to be kept up, and seeing the trucks that have trucked through my communities over the years from Bruce, I can relate to that issue.

I think a number of people have said, and it's even been related here and even a number of people in the communities have said, that the bill needs to go a little bit further. One chap I was talking to reminded us about the Aggregate Resources Act, and maybe tie it in that there are some lines there that need to be drawn, so there is a very formal process to even talk about the need should there be water out of the area, regardless of do we get fees or who's doing it or the work that's involved.

I'm supportive of this bill. I would hope that it can be used in context with all the good work that MOE has done and needs to do, and other ideas like that brought up when I was at the Lions Club in Formosa that evening, about strengthening the bill. That's the context that this bill can be worked in with and move forward and on that, I support the bill.



I have a colleague who has a couple of things he'd like to say.

1150

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** There are 54 seconds left.

**Mr Noel Duignan (Halton North):** I rise in support of this particular bill. I believe this bill will start a very important debate that needs to happen, not only in this Legislature but indeed in the province as a whole, because we must begin to deal with water as a resource and how we're abusing that resource, whether we're abusing it by putting chemicals in it or whether we're dumping raw sewage in it or indeed putting a garbage landfill site at the head of waterways.

I was very pleased to see the member for Grey get up and support this bill because I hope that indicates he is going to support my bill on third reading. Dumping landfill sites at the head of waterways also affects the quality of water and quality of life downstream for municipalities that are affected by that, but I do support this bill.

**Mr Elston:** I'm pleased to wrap up, with a limited amount of time. I am pleased that generally speaking I have the support of the House. There isn't any question at all that this means, I think, that generally the caucuses, having discussed this, although this is private members' time, have, interestingly, indicated that they are generally in favour of moving on the issue of water.

I wanted to address a couple of the points that were raised, the first by my colleague from Dufferin-Peel who basically has told us that the province hasn't done a good job in a number of places, and that they can't actually get the work done, but he still wants them to do the work instead of the local municipalities.

I don't understand his reasoning. I think I understand that what he's trying to do is develop a bit of a legislative speech that he can copy and send out to the water trucking association and that's okay, but I think he should be up front and just say, "Listen, I'm supporting this so I can send the transcript of my remarks to the water truckers to say that I support you."

I don't think there's any need to beat around the bush. This is the only way that the work will actually get done. You know that there are 16 water permits issued in the province of Ontario at the current time for people taking more than 50,000 litres per day.

In one article that was brought to my attention out of the Owen Sound Sun Times series of articles which I talked about earlier, that was indicated to be enough to supply a city of 112,500 people over the course of a year. That's just with the number of permits that have been issued now. That's a very astounding or astonishing figure, and what is more important is that we don't really even know what the effect is going to be of the taking of that much water over the long term.

I was talking to one of my colleagues from the new Democratic Party and he has actually been to a couple of places in the United States where the taking of water has not only dried up the underground system, but it has actually started to allow the surface of the soil to settle.

There's actually a hole being created because all the water has been pumped out from under parts of the United States of America. That should be enough to really cause us concern. It is for me.

I'll go on to reply to the second point raised by the member for Middlesex, and I wish that the bill itself could actually tell you the process that you go through arriving at this clause or that clause, and I know any number of you have done your own, but when we were talking about the provision of charging on the maximum amount of water to be used, the way that we thought we could best conserve the volume of water was by saying, "If you apply for 200,000 litres, you've got to pay for it." We hoped that would moderate the amount of water people would apply for and make them go to the lowest amount rather than having this open or almost open book as to the volume of water to take.

In many ways, I think we have the same idea in mind. I just chose to do that so that everybody would be aware that I don't apply for the maximum I think I may want, but that I am only going to apply for what I am going to need and therefore that is going to make sure that there is no open-ended volume of water to take.

At the same time, if their business were to grow and they had to go beyond the amount they applied for, they would have to do a new application. They would have to provide new hydrogeological materials to satisfy the ministry and the local municipality that they weren't going to imperil the water supply. In my view, that is a much more prudent, probably careful way of addressing the issue of conservation. I appreciate the issue being raised. I was actually going to do it in my own remarks to try and get people to understand, but I am happy that the member for Middlesex has raised it, because it did give me a chance to go back there.

I want to bring to the attention of the House one of my biases in this whole thing. Along with the fact that there is a very interesting local issue which has extremely important consequences, in my view, for the province in terms of water supply, I am one of those people who was learning through our education system, up through the late 1950s and 1960s and into the early 1970s, and hopefully still am learning but outside school, thinking about all the things that the nation of Canada may have done errantly in the past.

One of the biggest problems, in my view, has been the experience that has been suffered in the province of British Columbia with the Columbia water diversion. If anybody had a chance, I just happened to be able to watch last night the Suzuki program on water, which I thought was very good indeed. The results of that Columbia water diversion now are really being felt strongly by some of the people along the watercourse. The park out on the Peace River, Woodland National Park, I think it's called, is perhaps jeopardized by that Columbia water diversion. The fact that hydro is not now necessarily the major reason for the diversion of the water, but the water itself is probably the major reason for the diversion, is enough in my view to make your heart stop with respect to the things that we are doing now without any understanding of what the consequences are.

That's why this bill is very critical in my view to bringing people back to understanding what this means to my local municipality. That can be any municipality right around the province. It's interesting to note, by the way, that the member for Kitchener-Wilmot spoke briefly and mentioned the region of Waterloo. Waterloo, I am told, now is consuming only about 166 litres per day per person, which is well below the 360 or 340, whichever is right, litres of water, on average, that we use in this province. That's good progress. But you know, we still don't understand what is going to take place. We don't understand what 900,000 litres a year taken from the well in Formosa is going to mean in the long term.

I am proud to move this bill today. I ask for the people's support and generally I understand that I have it. There is one piece of other business which I understand is extremely critical. I'd ask people that when they vote they also support this going out to the resources committee so that we can really talk in depth about it.

#### WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT (RE-EMPLOYMENT), 1993

#### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES ACCIDENTS DU TRAVAIL (RENGAGEMENT)

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** The time provided for private members' public business has expired. We will deal first with ballot item number 43, standing in the name of Mr Morrow. If any members are opposed to a vote on this ballot item, will they please rise.

Mr Morrow has moved second reading of Bill 129, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

I declare the motion carried.

According to standing order 94(k), the bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

**Mr Mark Morrow (Wentworth East):** Mr Speaker, I would like it to go to the resources development committee.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Should the bill go to the resources development committee?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

Those who are in favour, would you please rise.

Those opposed will please rise.

A majority of the House not being in agreement with the request of the member, this bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

#### WATER EXTRACTION AGREEMENTS ACT, 1993

#### LOI DE 1993 SUR LES ENTENTES PORTANT SUR L'EXTRACTION D'EAU

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** We will now deal with ballot item number 44 standing in the name of Mr Elston. Mr Elston has moved second reading of Bill 126, An Act respecting Wayter Extraction Agreements.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to standing order 96(k), the bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I prefer it to go to the resources development committee.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Shall the bill be referred to the resources development committee?

All those in favour of the bill going to the committee will please rise.

All those opposed to the bill being sent to the committee will please rise.

The majority of the House not being in agreement, this bill will therefore be referred to the committee of the whole House.

We've debated all the bills that we were planning to debate. I will now leave the chair and the House will resume at 1:30 this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1202 to 1330.*

#### ANNUAL REPORT, COMMISSION ON ELECTION FINANCES

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I beg to inform the House I have today laid upon the table the 19th annual report of the Commission on Election Finances, which covers the year 1993.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### PUBLIC CONSULTATION

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale):** This NDP government is still guided by the mistaken notion that big government knows best, when we know that in most instances it's the community and its members who know best.

We were informed recently—this week, in fact—that the Queen St Mental Health Centre is undergoing a \$2-million expansion which will include a 20-bed unit for the criminally insane. The centre has confirmed that.

This was done without community consultation and without even consultation with its political representatives. This centre will now open in August, according to Ms Stuart. It says that in the future Toronto could get substantial numbers of maximum- and medium-security beds for criminally insane patients. Again, the objection here is that the community should have been consulted.

Second, we learned in November 1993 that the local probation and parole field office, which was located at the Dufferin Mall, had suddenly shifted and was now at the very centre of the south Parkdale community.

I was exasperated over the fact that the recommendation to relocate this office, with a case load of 1,400 adults, was made by someone who never lived in the community and had, consequently, no idea of what to do.

##### FIRE SAFETY

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** Yesterday, out of sheer frustration, the Mississauga city council passed a resolution to allow fire safety officials to inspect rental units without search warrants. It is a step that could well be followed by all municipalities which have basement apartments or other apartments in houses.



The legislation to address this problem, Bill 120, legalizes basement apartments but fails to provide the necessary safety measures for those who live in them.

The Minister of Housing indicates that fire regulations will require that smoke detectors be installed, but there is no additional authority for municipalities to be able to enter, to inspect and to make sure that basement apartments meet the safety regulations.

This legislation places the onus on the tenant to request such an inspection, and in all likelihood numerous apartments will not be inspected.

Municipalities have told the Minister of Housing and fire chiefs have told the Minister of Housing that the Fire Marshals Act does not grant sufficient authority to municipalities to ensure safety, nor does any other act.

I quote the fire chief of the city of Mississauga: "The municipalities' hands are tied. It's now up to the provincial Legislature to give us the tools to deal with these apartments."

I hope the Minister of Housing is listening.

#### GRIMSBY HAWK WATCH

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** I rise to tell the House about a very uplifting event that will take place in my riding tomorrow, the fourth annual hawk watch at Beamer Memorial Conservation Area atop the Niagara Escarpment in Grimsby.

This special open house gives the public a unique opportunity to see hawks soaring on the thermal updrafts as they wing their way northward on the spring migration route.

It is hosted by the Niagara Peninsula Hawkwatch and the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.

Visitors will likely see a large number of red-tailed hawks, red-shouldered hawks and some eagles and Cooper's hawks.

Experts will be on hand to help visitors identify the hawks as they fly overhead and to give hourly talks on why birds migrate and how they manage to travel so effortlessly.

Also, a rehabilitated hawk will be released into the wild by Mary Ellen Hebb of the nearby Owl Foundation.

The hawk watch open house will run from 9 am until 3 pm, with children's activities scheduled from 11 till noon. The rain date is Saturday, April 2. There is no charge for the event, and visitors are urged to dress warmly and bring a lawn chair, binoculars and a bird guide.

I would also like to pay tribute to the many volunteers from the Niagara Peninsula Hawkwatch who come out each spring to count and tally the passing hawks. From March until early May, they station themselves at Beamer Point and count thousands of hawks. This vital information is then sent to the Hawk Watch Migration Association of North America, where experts examine the data and assess the health of the hawk population.

I urge my elected colleagues and their constituents to come to Grimsby tomorrow and join in the hawk watch. What an awesome way to enjoy the unique resources of our beautiful and well-protected Niagara Escarpment. My

assistant and his wife and his young son will be there, and I will be there with my family also.

#### GASOLINE PRICES

**Mr Frank Micalash (Kenora):** On January 24, 1994, I wrote to the Premier to remind him of the promises and commitments made by him and the senior members of his government to equalize the price of gasoline across the province.

I reminded the Premier of a 1991 statement he made that the NDP government "is concerned about the high price of gasoline in northern Ontario and the burden it places on motorists." I reminded the Premier of the promise made by Shelley Martel in 1990 during the election campaign that "gas prices must be equalized across the province." I reminded the Premier of Gilles Pouliot's 1991 comments that as a northerner and as a consumer, he wants the assurance that he is being treated fairly and that he is getting a fair shake for his hard-earned dollar.

On January 12, 1994, the price of gas in Windsor was reported at 46.6 cents per litre, while on the same day the price of gas in Pickle Lake was listed at 68.6 cents per litre. That's nearly a 20-cents-per-litre difference. On March 16, the prices were Windsor 49.6 cents and Pickle Lake 67.9 cents—the difference, 16 cents per litre.

Members of this government have clearly declared their commitment to equalize the price of gas between northern and southern Ontario, but today absolutely no action has been taken to address this issue by this government. This government quite simply has not done anything to fulfil its commitment to the people of northern Ontario.

#### JACK MORRIS

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I rise in the House today to pay tribute to a man who will be sadly missed in the community of Prescott, Ontario. Jack Morris was editor and publisher of the Prescott Journal, retiring in 1977 after a career in community newspapers that began in 1926. His avid concern for the community he lived in and the lives of those in it can be shown in his lengthy list of contributions and accomplishments.

A founding member of the Grenville County Historical Society, he worked to create Prescott's own Forwarders museum, a museum tracking the history of Prescott and the St Lawrence River.

A recipient of several awards for community dedication, Jack's lifelong interest in local history prompted him to write a book on the history of Prescott as a personal centennial project. The book succeeded in giving Prescott residents a new-found pride in their home town and its place in national history.

In his varied and active career, Jack was also a militiaman and a soldier, serving with the Canadian Army in France, Belgium, and Holland.

As a musician who got his start in the 1920s playing piano for silent movies, Jack served as organist for several years at local churches and most recently contributed to entertainment for fellow residents in his retirement home.

Jack Morris was a man who was very generous with his time, a man who chose to put his vision of his

community ahead of any conflicts of personality. He will be greatly missed.

#### EVENTS IN NIAGARA REGION

**Ms Margaret H. Harrington (Niagara Falls):** We hope it's going to be a warm and wonderful weekend. I invite you, Mr Speaker, members of the Legislature and the people of Ontario watching to come and visit Niagara Falls and Niagara region. Come for a picnic on the Niagara Parkway or bring your bike and cycle. We have 50 kilometres of bicycle path, from beautiful, romantic Niagara-on-the-Lake all the way to old Fort Erie.

If you come and stay over and enjoy one of our new and moderately priced accommodations, then you can visit the whole region. We have so much to offer. How about a winery tour from Grimsby right through to the historic cellars of Bright's in Niagara Falls, or we have a new pamphlet on the Black History Tour. The end of the Underground Railway came from Buffalo through to Niagara. You can investigate a secret tunnel from the river bank up to a well-known safe house for slaves. There's also the tiny, hidden-away BME Church on Peer Street in Niagara Falls. You can take a historic bus tour to see the battlefields of the War of 1812 at Chippawa and Lundy's Lane. You can also explore the route of the Welland Canal up from Lake Ontario to Lake Erie.

There is so much more to Niagara. For decades, other provincial governments have ignored us. Now our government is working hard to enhance and preserve the beauty and history of Niagara for tourism. Come and visit us. The blossoms will soon be out from Queenston to Queen Victoria Park.

1340

#### PREMIER OF ONTARIO

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** This morning at 7:14—that early, it must have been very, very important—I got a message over the fax machine and the message is addressed primarily to the Premier, and I'm glad that he is here and able to listen to it. However, it also interests the whole NDP caucus and in particular the members from eastern Ontario.

Here is what Dawn Wallace, who is from Wolfe Island, has to say, and I'm very pleased to share this message with you, Mr Speaker. It says:

"For the record, can you please make Premier Rae know: I want him to quit. I say this in response to his comments in the Legislature yesterday. Apparently he is under the impression no one wants him to quit...

"I'm very thankful the CBC played the excerpt from yesterday's Queen's Park session. Obviously Premier Rae has delusions about public opinion. So let me repeat and add, I want him to quit, my husband wants him to quit, hundreds of my neighbours who are fighting the slated June 1st highway tax to be implemented on the Kingston Wolfe Island crossing want him to quit.

"I would appreciate if you can set the Premier straight.

"With thanks,

"Dawn Wallace."

I'm very pleased to convey this message. If I can have a page, I'd like to pass it over to the Premier, please.

#### HERITAGE CONSERVATION

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I rise today to bring to the attention of this House that we have a minister without portfolio destroying heritage buildings in this province.

NDP members Shirley Coppen and Margaret Harrington gleefully participated in the destruction of two buildings in Niagara Falls with historical value to make way for the new Culture, Tourism and Recreation office.

Let me read to you from the subsequent release an article that appeared in the ministry newsletter:

"The sound of shattering glass and the crunching of bricks made a sweet sound when associate minister Shirley Coppen joined a media conference at the site of the ministry's new office."

This was not a sweet sound for all who heard about this destruction. The Caledon Heritage Committee in Dufferin-Peel was appalled that the minister without portfolio responsible for culture in this province was so pleased to participate in the destruction of a heritage building.

In their letter to the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation, the Caledon Heritage Committee states: "We deal on a continual basis with behaviour like this from ill-informed people who see no merit in conserving Ontario's heritage. How will any of us be able to continue to work to incorporate heritage with new construction and promote conservation and reuse if this is the example your ministry is setting?"

If this attitude from Mrs Coppen wasn't bad enough, when I wrote the Premier on this issue, his letter back to me amounted to, "I have noted your comments."

How can the heritage committees of Ontario feel that they have support from this ministry and government if this is how Bob Rae's government is going to respond?

#### JOBS ONTARIO

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** I can't for the life of me understand why the official opposition and the third party continue to criticize and condemn the NDP Jobs Ontario program. The cynical, irrational members opposite continue their doom-and-gloom approach to a program that has proven itself time and time again.

I've talked to many people from the Hamilton-Wentworth area and they're telling me that they think the Liberals and Tories are blowing in the wind. Since the program began in the fall of 1992, 2,034 people in Hamilton-Wentworth have been placed in jobs, and it is estimated that many more jobs will be created in the Hamilton-Wentworth area by the end of the program. And its success does not stop in Hamilton-Wentworth. Thousands of jobs have been created and maintained throughout the province of Ontario.

Another feature that people in my riding like is the fact that both employers and employees benefit from the program. It creates a balance of assistance during these difficult economic times.

The people in my area continually read in the Hamilton Spectator and other fine newspapers in the area of the many success stories of this government's Jobs



Ontario. So, to my critical friends across the floor, the program is working, and it's working well not only in the Hamilton-Wentworth area but across the province of Ontario.

#### MEMBERS' PRIVILEGE

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Yesterday the member for Leeds-Grenville, Mr Runciman, rose in the House on a question of privilege concerning a recent newspaper article on certain cabinet deliberations. The member requested the Speaker to determine whether there may have been a violation of members' privileges by reason of an alleged breach of cabinet confidentiality.

I have reviewed yesterday's Hansard, our precedents and the usual parliamentary authorities. I find that the precedent that is closest to the circumstances raised by the member for Leeds-Grenville is a 1980 ruling concerning a newspaper article on taxation measures. The article was published a few days before a scheduled budgetary announcement in the House. Speaker Stokes stated the following at page 4215 of our Hansard for November 13, 1980:

"The chair cannot be asked to rule on something that took place by way of an interview. The chair similarly cannot be expected to monitor whether or not there has been a breach of cabinet solidarity."

Turning to the case raised by the member for Leeds-Grenville, I find that the publication of the newspaper article does not establish a *prima facie* case of privilege. However, I thank the honourable member for Leeds-Grenville for his concerns and for bringing them to my attention.

#### STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES HEALTH INSURANCE

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** Today the government is moving ahead with measures that will help us preserve our health care system.

In last year's budget, we promised to tighten OHIP rules by restricting benefits to residents of Ontario. The measures I am announcing today will save the taxpayers of this province about \$48 million annually.

As well, we are formally asking the federal government to assume its responsibility for refugee claimants in Ontario by paying their health care costs. Ottawa already does this in most other provinces.

Starting April 1, most people who arrive in Ontario but do not plan to live here permanently will no longer receive free health care benefits. Temporary residents already here will continue to be covered by OHIP until June 30. This will give them time to arrange for private health insurance. The Ministry of Health is contacting the people involved to make sure they are aware of this change.

We will continue with our firm policy that absolutely no one in this province will be denied urgent care by an Ontario hospital or community health clinic, regardless of their OHIP status.

We need these changes to ensure the high quality of Ontario's health care services. Our government has been implementing its plan to protect services by spending

carefully and wisely. After 10 years of health care spending rising out of control in Ontario, we stepped in with some commonsense management and held the increase in spending last year to under 1%. Maintaining the best possible health care for Ontarians remains our priority and our commitment.

This change affects about 66,000 people in the province who have been covered by OHIP despite their status as temporary residents in Ontario, including some 22,000 foreign workers and their families, and 19,000 international students.

Previous governments have allowed international students and foreign workers to use Ontario's health care system since the 1970s. But we need tighter controls on health care spending today to preserve the system for Ontario residents.

#### 1350

I have contacted Sergio Marchi, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, to formally request that Ottawa pay health care costs for refugee claimants. There are 28,000 refugee claimants in Ontario, and their medical bills cost Ontario taxpayers \$32.5 million annually. We cannot afford to go on paying Ottawa's bills, but we will not let refugee claimants suffer from federal neglect. We will continue to provide health care coverage until Ottawa is prepared to treat its responsibilities in Ontario with the same commitment it has shown in other provinces.

In addition to the changes I've already mentioned, we are introducing a three-month waiting period for OHIP coverage, following the British Columbia and New Brunswick models. Beginning today, new residents will have to wait three months before coverage begins. Ontario residents who spend more than 183 days outside the province will also have a three-month wait upon their return unless they have made prior arrangements with OHIP. This change is expected to save Ontarians about \$18 million annually by preventing people from coming to Ontario for the sole purpose of receiving health care, then leaving again.

Some people, such as Canadian Forces personnel, will be exempt. And, of course, babies born to Ontario residents are covered immediately.

Ontario's health care system is one of the best in the world. We have some of the finest doctors, nurses, midwives, researchers and staff that could be found anywhere. Our government is determined to see that this system endures to serve Ontario today and in the future. The decisions I have outlined today are difficult but they are fair, and they will help us to preserve health care in Ontario now and in the years to come.

**Hon Anne Swarbrick (Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation):** I understand there is an agreement among the House leaders to say a few words regarding Ontario's winter Olympians. Is there unanimous consent?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** If it would be of assistance to the honourable member, perhaps we could have the responses to the statement by the Minister of Health, and then we would return for your request.

Responses by the official opposition: the honourable member for Halton North.

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** It's Halton Centre, Mr Speaker. We'll get it right yet.

I'm interested in the announcement that the Minister of Health has made today, particularly since we have been looking forward to seeing some movement in terms of information systems and other controls put into place in the health care system following what in my view was an extremely weak and badly prepared report out of her ministry, and I believe her ex-deputy concurred with that view of the report, with respect to health card fraud.

The announcement the minister has made today addresses some of the issues which have been very clearly discussed in other committees. I want to respond by saying first of all, with respect to the refugee issue, or generally with respect to the coverage issue itself, we know that medicare provides Canadians with a universal health insurance plan that's part of the way we define ourselves. We all pay for the plan through taxes and through employer contributions, and many of us make contributions in kind or in cash to facilities and to agencies and institutions to help supplement those tax-supported places.

Every person in Ontario wants to be assured that those who receive health care services through medicare are in fact eligible to receive those services. Every person who receives health care benefits and is not eligible for them strips access from those who have the legal right to those services.

I personally don't understand why, in the history of Ontario health care and the evolution of our medicare system, the coverage of refugees has been by the province for many, many years, where in other provincial situations the payment for refugee coverage for health services has been assumed by the federal government. Perhaps in the past there was a tax point agreement or some other scenario. None the less, we are in a situation where, unlike most other Canadian provinces, our province has covered refugee coverage.

Despite whatever caused that situation, I think the initiative the minister has taken in writing to the federal Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is a useful one. I would have preferred, however, if she had been more specific in stating how she will ensure that people who are refugees and whose premiums, I suppose you could call them, are now being negotiated will in fact be covered.

The question of international students and the removal of OHIP coverage from international students is also one I wish the minister had expanded on. For several months we have been receiving correspondence from colleges and universities which have been asking what steps the minister intended to take in this area, so that those international students who were coming to Ontario for studies would understand what steps they had to take before they arrived here. We simply have a statement that says international students won't be covered, and there are no further details. It's not good enough. The consultation hasn't been good enough, and I believe international students will be caught in a no-win situation.

Similarly, the foreign worker issue is one that as well adds problematic areas. Many of the foreign workers who are in Ontario on a temporary basis are agricultural

workers who come in under federal-provincial agreements for temporary periods of time. I know, because I have discussed this issue, that there has been no full discussion with the Ontario Federation of Agriculture with respect to coverage. If they are covered, as the Premier is signalling to me across the hall, then surely that information should have been included in the statement so the issue could have been made very clear.

There is a subtle shift that is of very deep concern to senior citizens with respect to the statement that Ontario residents who spend more than 183 days outside the province will also have a three-month wait for services. This is a direct hit on senior citizens who spend winter months outside the province and, when they come back, may want to visit another province to visit family and friends.

When medicare was introduced, one of the principles of medicare was that the services and coverage would be portable from province to province. Medicare did not contemplate that people would be penalized by not being able to receive services in other provinces.

**The Speaker:** The member's time has expired. Responses, third party.

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I want to say in response to the Minister of Health's statement today regarding temporary residents and refugees that I find it a very curious statement indeed. I would have thought, and we've been expecting for some time, that this government would do something to fix the Liberal health card system that was brought into this province during the Liberal time in office. They've done nothing about that.

Minister, you've got over 12 million health cards out there now, and it's growing every day. You've got \$700 million worth of fraud a year, by your ministry's own estimate. Of the 66,000 temporary residents you're cutting off today, how do you know how many of them have health cards? Given the flawed system you have, how are you going to get those health cards back from those 66,000 people who may have them? If you don't get their cards back, and given the way the system is today, you may take their names out of your nice, fancy little computer here at Queen's Park, but they'll bring their card to a doctor or to a hospital and they'll still be able to access the system, and that doctor or hospital will be stuck with the bill because a few days later, 30 or 60 days later, your ministry will say, "Oh, we've cancelled that card."

You've announced nothing today to fix the health card system. You've got \$700 million worth of fraud. I suggest you get back to this House ASAP and tell us how you're going to fix the health card system. We've given you all kinds of suggestions, we forced you before a committee, we've done our homework on it, and we've put out our suggestions publicly. I welcome you to take our suggestions and fix the system. Now, I know you inherited the system, and I know it was a badly introduced system, but you've got to show some leadership. You've been the government for years, and you've done nothing to fix that system.

I suggest you get your own house in order. I note on page 2 that there's a little federal-bashing going on. You're blaming the feds for not paying for refugees. I



doubt, Minister, you're going to get that \$32 million from the federal government. If I were the federal government, I'd say: "Why would I give you \$32 million when you've got \$700 million worth of fraud in your own system? Get your own house in order."

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** In respect to the minister's announcement, I want to express concern about what I consider to be a rather piecemeal approach to a significant problem.

We know these costs are impacting not only in the health care area. I raised an order paper question back in 1992 which indicated that in 1991-92 the costs in respect to legal aid to refugees were in the neighbourhood of \$18 million a year. We know it's impacting on education. We know it's impacting on welfare. Metro Toronto has expressed very serious concerns about the costs the municipality is having to absorb because of the lack of assistance and relief available to it from the senior levels of government in respect to immigration and refugee policy.

I would think, Minister and Premier, that this should be approached on a government-wide basis, at a first ministers' conference perhaps, in respect to having some sort of agreement similar to what Quebec has, and more recognition from the federal level in respect to the costs and implications for the province of Ontario and the Metropolitan Toronto area especially.

1400

**The Speaker:** Earlier I had recognized the Honourable Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation.

**Hon Ms Swarbrick:** Might there now be unanimous consent for a few words to honour Ontario's winter Olympians?

**The Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed.

#### OLYMPIC ATHLETES

**Hon Anne Swarbrick (Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation):** I'm honoured to rise in the House today to pay tribute to a truly special group of talented and dedicated individuals: Ontario's 1994 Olympic athletes. This morning, Premier Rae and I hosted a reception to express Ontario's appreciation to these remarkable athletes, their coaches and their families, to thank them on behalf of the province for the many thrilling moments they gave us last month in Lillehammer. The Premier and I were joined by many of our colleagues from all parties in the Ontario Legislature.

Our Olympian athletes' performances demonstrated clearly that Ontario is home to some of the world's very best athletes. The road to Olympic athletic status is a long and difficult one, marked by hard work and sacrifice. That makes their achievements all the more worthy.

Many of these outstanding athletes started as youngsters as part of a community sports program or club. When I see what they have accomplished, I feel a special sense of pride in the support Ontario taxpayers provide to assist athletes through the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation's athletic development programs and Ontario Games program. With the support of these programs, young athletes gain the experience, the confidence and composure to compete at the national and international level.

These Ontario stars are role models for all Ontarians and for our youth, showing us the value of sport and athletic competition to our culture, to help lay the groundwork for international tourism and trade and, more importantly, to promote healthy, active living, to develop in Ontario youth important qualities of self-esteem, self-discipline, a sense of accomplishment for hard work and a high quality of life.

Mr Speaker, will you and the honourable members join me in extending our congratulations to Ontario's Olympic athletes, as well as our heartfelt thanks for the enjoyment and sense of pride they have given to all of Ontario?

*Applause.*

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming):** I'm honoured to stand in my place today to represent the Liberal caucus in carrying on the salute to our Olympic athletes, who really carried our Canadian flag very well in Norway in February of this year.

If they were here today, I would say to them that they should be very proud of themselves and all their accomplishments. They should be proud of their hard work and their sportsmanship and how they handled themselves, their deportment over there, how they handled all that pressure. We see this from our very comfortable chairs, looking across, via satellite, to the tremendous stress they're under with the competition, worldwide, that's so great. They handled themselves very well, handled that stress and pressure very well, and they showed great support for their fellow athletes. We support them and salute them for that.

I'd also like to mention, as the minister did, the tremendous support shown to those athletes by their families and by their coaches. When we watch those events, we sometimes take it for granted that those young women and men just on their own accomplished that and maybe forget that it took years to achieve those different skills, and it took parents driving children to the hockey rink early in the morning, or to the ski hills and other venues—and coaches with them—to really make that all happen.

It doesn't happen overnight. It's been years and years of hard work and dedication to make that happen. We were all very proud of them and we wish them well in their future.

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I'm very happy to rise on behalf of the Conservative caucus to congratulate Canada's winter Olympic team. Thirteen will be a lucky number from now on, because in the 17th Winter Olympic Games it was definitely Canada's lucky number: 13 medals were won, setting a record for this country.

To the members of the Canadian Olympic team, we are proud of you. Please accept our congratulations on a superb job. Our Canadian team exemplified the values the Olympics stand for: the execution of one's sport to the best of one's ability, team spirit, cooperation and fair play. Canadians across the country were very proud to see these athletes exhibit all these characteristics. All 129 of the Canadian participants merit our praise and our thanks. You have made Canada proud.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The thoughtful

and generous comments by the members for Scarborough West, Timiskaming and Wellington will be forwarded to the athletes whom you have identified today and so properly praised.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a question for the Premier. This question is totally within the jurisdiction of the provincial government and the Premier, has nothing to do with the federal government, has nothing to do with previous governments, has nothing to do with the opposition parties, has nothing to do with the Americans, has nothing to do with the media, has everything to do with you. And it's not about a potential OPP investigation of yesterday's leak. It's not that; I don't want to worry him about that.

It's not long ago that we heard the lofty words in the first speech from the throne of this government:

"My government's integrity will be measured by the way this government is run and our relations with the people we serve. Our task is to guard against institutional arrogance and the abuse of power wherever they exist."

It seems the government has found it difficult to guard against arrogance and refrain from abusing power, because according to documents we have obtained through freedom of information, between the time that speech was read and February 1994, your government, Mr Premier, has managed to spend over \$8 million on polling and other surveys. You have been so busy polling and surveying that you have averaged—listen to this—one poll a week since taking office.

At a time when you are imposing unprecedented spending cuts on services to people in this province and you are taking money out of the pockets of people who work in the public sector, how can you justify spending \$8.3 million of taxpayers' money on polls and surveys to tell you what you're supposed to think?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I would refer this to the Chairman of Management Board.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** I thank the member opposite for the question. It's a very useful question the member raises, because I think our friends in the gallery and the public of Ontario know governments traditionally have done polling to find the opinions of the people of this province about a whole range of issues that the government is working on in terms of government initiative.

At the same time, this government has viewed polling as part of our overall approach to cost restraint in the province of Ontario. I'd like to point out that the previous government, the Liberal government of this province, spent a total of \$15 million on polls and \$12.1 million on market surveys. Those costs have been substantially reduced by this government over the last three and a half years and we will continue to reduce those costs as we refine the way in which we do our market research.

1410

**Mr Bradley:** We're looking, of course, in the context of the Chair of Management Board, who has imposed all kinds of cuts on the people of this province, a man who

was part of an opposition previously that was totally opposed to what they called cynical polling, trying to justify it.

Yesterday we learned about the election strategy the Premier's campaign manager, David Agnew, has designed while earning about \$135,000 of the taxpayers' money. We refer to that as Wepppler's list, after Murray Wepppler's suggestions as to what the government might do to make itself look good.

Today we learned that the Premier and you and the rest of the government have managed to approve over \$8 million in polls and research. Now, it's clear that this is a government that, because it has a poll a week, doesn't move without calling a pollster. It's all there and you've polled on it all.

Isn't it true, Mr Minister—and Mr Premier, because I know he's listening; didn't want to answer this—that you are stopping work on virtually every government initiative that the polls tell you will not fly in the upcoming election?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** It would appear that the member opposite likes to try to change the topic when the first issue doesn't fly very well. I can't let the fact go that this government has cut the cost of polling that it does, the market research that it does with the people of the province so that the work we do is useful, by more than 50% from what the past administration used to do.

With respect to the second part of the member's question about whether we've cut all the issues that polling would indicate the public has some difficulty with, the answer to the question is just a very blunt and straightforward no.

**Mr Bradley:** When the Premier and his colleagues went to the people of this province in 1990 and received support from those people, the people who voted for them may not have agreed with the policies of the New Democratic Party, which they considered to be not within the mainstream of Ontario, and because the NDP at that time did not have experience in government and had some economic theories that were not generally accepted, they may not have believed that the government could manage the economy and the governing of this province well, but the one thing they did believe was that Bob Rae, as the Leader of the Opposition and as a man involved in politics over the years, would bring a new sense of ethics to politics in Ontario.

How can you justify then the expenditure of this \$8.3 million on polls and research, on cynical manipulation, as you used to refer to it, of the people of this province, and how do you square that with the presentation that you have, to the people of this province, of a new code of ethics?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** I just have to repeat that the people of Ontario would probably be very happy to know that we've cut the cost of polling in this province by over 50%, and in response to the specific question the member has raised, we've cut out all of the cynical part of the process.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.



## CHILD CARE

**Mr Charles Beer (York-Mackenzie):** My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Minister, we've now heard at least one answer today about the priorities of this government, where money ought to be spent. I want to turn to another area that we feel ought to be a priority one for any government today.

You must be aware that the child care community in this province was shocked to learn this morning that this government is abandoning its promise to reform the existing child care system. What we need to know today from you is exactly what your plans are for the reform of child care between today and the next provincial election.

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I hope that we'll be in a position fairly soon to be able to outline in detail what we can do with respect to further enhancement in the area of child care, but I want to tell the honourable member very clearly two things: There will be continued improvements in the area of child care beyond what we've managed to do so far, and quite frankly how much we can do will also depend on the discussions that are going on now between us and the federal government.

**Mr Beer:** There are two critical things that need to be said in response to that answer and in posing my supplementary. I stood in February 1990 in the present minister's place when the original cutbacks to federal funding for child care were started, and if there was one reality that came from that statement in February 1990, it was that no federal government, whether Conservative, Liberal or New Democrat, was going to be providing further funds in the areas of social services, health care and education. That was the reality. Anything that is and has been said by this government about federal funding now is political rhetoric and political posturing.

What we are after is, what is this government's plan and what is it going to do for child care? I have in my hand a document that was before cabinet on February 21 of this year, and it deals with child care. I think when we read this document, we have a clearer sense of why you have backed off child care reform.

I want to quote from this document on the page titled "Communications Environment." It states, and I quote: "Very high expectations exist among some public interest groups about the government's intentions for child care reform. Among the general public, however, those expectations do not exist. Focus groups conducted in August indicate that for the most part the general public is not aware of the government's stated intention to reform the child care system."

I think what one would want to know from the minister is, did your focus groups include any of the 25,000 families currently on the waiting list or the thousands currently in the existing centres? You know what \$8 million could do to reform and expand the child care system. What we need to know today is not what the NDP spin doctors are telling Bob Rae to do, but what are you, as Minister of Community and Social Services, going to do to reform and expand and make a better child care system in this province instead of beginning to destroy it?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** The member opened his supplementary by talking about the realities. Let's talk about the realities. In the 1990-91 fiscal year, there were 46,600 fee subsidies in the system. In this current fiscal year, there are 64,600 subsidized spaces in the system. That's an increase of 18,000 subsidized spaces as a result of actions that this government has taken.

Overall, in terms of dollars that are being spent on child care to pay for those subsidies and to improve the quality of child care in the province, again, in 1990-91 we were spending \$350 million; this fiscal year we are spending \$525 million: significant increases.

We haven't stood around waiting for the federal government to decide what to do. We have been acting. We have continued to add spaces to the system. We have continued to stabilize the system as a result of those actions and, yes, we have continued and are continuing to look at what further improvements we can make.

I'm confident that we can make some more improvements to the system and will be able to outline those I hope fairly shortly, but I think that it's important for the member opposite to understand that what Ottawa does, does have an impact on what this government can do, and we need to be very up front about that. It's not a question of saying we need to get an allocation of *X* millions of dollars from the federal government with respect to necessarily directly the issue of child care—

1420

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Will the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** —but what the federal government does in the whole area of financing affects all of what we can do in all of the areas of our own financing. We have to look at those issues—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister please conclude his response.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** —and we have to make priorities and we have to be able to balance all the different things we have to do. We are trying very hard within the dollars that we have at our disposal to bring about—

**The Speaker:** The minister has replied to the question.

**Mr Beer:** That answer simply doesn't wash. You can't keep going back and blaming the federal government when you have known that there wasn't going to be more money in the system. You can't blame it on what you don't have. What is clear is that right now there is chaos in the system. There are empty spaces and no money for people to fill those spaces. You are not even doing what you said you were going to do in terms of the new places that were to be created. You have instead gone off on a warpath with the private day care operators to get rid of spaces there that you need. You are aiming your guns all over the place and as a result the system is presently in chaos.

In this same document it states very clearly that if the government does not begin to move on meaningful reform, what we will have is a child care system that is purely and simply a welfare system. What the minister doesn't recognize is that child care is a fundamental part

of an economic growth strategy. This is not just a social issue. The Premier talks constantly about the creation of jobs and yet his government is getting rid—

**The Speaker:** Could the member place his question please.

**Mr Beer:** —of child care spaces and getting rid of child care reform.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** That is false. That is a complete falsehood. That was a very complete and total answer.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Beer:** What I want to ask the minister is this: Minister, will you commit to this House to talk directly with the Premier, who is mouthing off words which nobody can hear right now, but when he's calmed down, will you go and talk to him and to the Treasurer and say: "Look, we need a meaningful child care reform. We need it for economic as well as social reasons"? Will you commit to do that this spring so that some hope can return to those out there who need child care to get back into the economic workforce? Will you make that commitment, Minister?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I don't need to stand here in the House and make a commitment that I am going to continue to speak with my Premier and with other ministers and members in this government who continue to support the further expansion of the child care system in this province. We believe very strongly in that. Not only do we believe that in words, but we believe it through the deeds we have accomplished. We have improved the child care system during some of the most difficult times in the province's history.

I could very well ask, what in heaven's name did the Liberals do during the boom years that they were in government when they could have fixed all these problems? I would suggest to the member opposite, who I know is genuinely interested in this issue—I know that to be true—that I would urge him and his colleagues to use some of that energy that they are using in the House today to also talk to their federal counterparts and say to them that when we are speaking to Minister Axworthy and others about further support that they can give us in the area of child care, they ought to respond positively and respond soon because that will also assist us to be able to do the kinds of things that he wants us to do and that we want to do.

#### GO TRANSIT MEETING

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** I have a question for the Premier. As we speak a delegation of officials from GO Transit are meeting in Hamilton, Bermuda. Could you tell us what they're doing there?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I will take notice of that question. The Minister of Transportation isn't here.

**Mr Eves:** Apart from enjoying the lovely surroundings in Bermuda, I am told that they may in fact be finalizing the sale of GO Transit rolling stock. Can you confirm that, and if so, why are they doing it on the island of Bermuda?

**Hon Mr Rae:** As I said to the honourable member, I can't confirm it. I will only say to him that I will take

notice of his question and seek a response for him on Monday.

**Mr Eves:** While the Premier is finding out that information for us, I'd appreciate it if he could have us an answer to these questions by this afternoon, not on Tuesday when the deal will probably be history. Who is there on behalf of the province of Ontario representing our interests and who is paying their way?

**Hon Mr Rae:** Again, I hope he would appreciate that, as I say, his question is one that deserves and requires an answer, but it's one that I am not in a position to give him. As soon as I—

**Mr Eves:** Nobody in your government knows the answer to this question? The deputy minister doesn't know? Nobody can find out?

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I didn't say that. Ernie, you and I both know that sometimes there are questions asked that I have to make certain inquiries about. I can assure you that I will.

#### ONTARIO ECONOMY

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** My question is also to the Premier. The Minister of Finance's statement last week was an admission that you've given up the fight against the deficit. One week later, rising interest rates are changing the deficit landscape. Every percentage point increase in interest rates costs the Ontario taxpayers roughly \$80 million. My question to you is this: Can you tell us specifically what the increasing interest rates mean for your deficit projections, and how you intend to deal with it if in fact you intend to deal with it at all?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I would say to the honourable member that his description of what the Treasurer said last week I think is grossly inaccurate. The deficit we have been projecting for next year will be substantially lower than this year. This year will represent a more than 20% decline from last year. This is going to be in marked contrast to the record of the federal government of which he was such a strong supporter until the last federal election. We have clearly set out on a path which we think is responsible and fair and balanced.

I would say to him that interest rates have gone up in the United States. The stock market has gone down in the United States. I suppose if I follow the member's logic, that's my fault too. I understand that the Japanese economy is experiencing some difficulty, and no doubt that's also my fault as well. There have been difficult events in Mexico, and I know the member will want to blame me for that as well.

I would say to the honourable member, no one knows. You read the newspapers, you talk to the economists, you talk to bank presidents and they'll give you 25 different opinions on what interest rates are going to do over the next three months and what they're going to do over the next year.

I believe strongly that we've got to stay on a steady path. The steady path is one of deficit reduction. The steady path is one of controlling costs. We've been more successful at controlling costs than any government since the Depression.



**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I take some pride in our record in this area and I can say to him that we're following a steady, consistent course and that we will be able to ride out any of these spikes and jags that we see going on in the marketplace. We have more confidence than that.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** You've got a \$10-billion deficit and you're controlling costs?

**The Speaker:** The member for Etobicoke West is out of order.

**Mr Carr:** This Premier says he is proud to be spending more on deficit servicing than he spends on the ministries of Housing, Municipal Affairs, Natural Resources, Environment and Energy, policing, Correctional Services and Agriculture combined. Premier, unless you move quickly, you are going to be known as a Premier who spent more on plastic than you spent on people.

My question to you is this: Do you have a plan to deal with this deficit or are you planning to be the first Premier who has had four downgrades in four years?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say to the honourable member that when the time comes for us to work with companies that want to locate in his constituency, he's the very first to look for aid and assistance from the government. When it comes to building schools in his constituency, he's the first to be there when the sod is turned. When it comes to making the kind of capital investments that will make a difference to his community or when it comes to making the kinds of expenditures that we have to make, he's the first one to say, "What a wonderful thing." Now he's saying that he wants the government of Ontario to do some kind of cheap imitation of Ralph Klein.

I can tell him right now we intend to follow a steady, sensible course. I would say to him that that's a course that I think any government would be following in these circumstances and it's one worthy of the name, not the kind of right-wing hysteria we're starting to see from the Tory party in this province.

1430

**Mr Carr:** The Toronto stock market is plunging, interest rates are rising, the Canadian dollar is falling, revenues are dropping. You'd almost think there was a Liberal government in Ottawa.

The money markets and the bond rating agencies are watching us intently. We need to get a clear signal from you. You can't afford to raise the deficit or to increase taxes. The only thing you can do is cut spending.

My question to the Premier is this: Are you prepared to act on that commitment to cut spending and will you do it today?

**Hon Mr Rae:** Where has the honourable member been? We have cut spending. Your party never did it. For 42 years, you never did it. Leslie Frost never did it. Leslie Frost was not able to do it. John Robarts never did it. Bill Davis never did it. Frank Miller never did it. David Peterson never did it.

**Mr Stockwell:** You should choke on those words. You don't belong in that category.

**The Speaker:** The member for Etobicoke West is out of order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** We have done it. We have reduced spending in the province of Ontario. We have done it in a responsible and fairminded way. That's exactly what we've done.

**Mr Stockwell:** You weren't a Leslie Frost, you are no John Robarts, and you are no John Kennedy.

**The Speaker:** The member for Etobicoke West is out of order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I can tell the honourable member the record will clearly show that we have met the most difficult challenge and we're going to be doing it in a responsible and fair way. But I can tell him again, we're not going to do it in the kind of mindless, truly thoughtless way that's going to lead to this kind of destruction of our social programs. We're not going to see the destruction of social programs. We're not going to do it in a cruel and thoughtless way. We're going to be doing it in a sensible way that has the support of the people of the province as we go through this period.

I can tell him, jobs are increasing, revenues are increasing, deficits are declining. The sky is not falling. Chicken Little should have no place in the Ontario Tory party. I'm surprised that the ideology of Chicken Little has taken over in the Liberal Party, it's taken over in the Tory party, and whether it's Turkey Lurkey or Chicken Licken or Henny Penny, it doesn't matter. The sky is falling over there. We see the sunshine.

**The Speaker:** Could the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** We see the corner being turned, we see a bright future for the province of Ontario, and that's the confidence that we see for our people.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** Prosperity abounds. The fairy tales are coming out of the Premier's mouth. What did any of that have to do with reality?

**The Speaker:** Order.

#### BUSINESS PRACTICES

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and has to do, really, with the government's priorities.

I think the minister knows that there are literally hundreds of people in the province who are being ripped off by what I think can only be described as shady loan brokers who demand an upfront payment, promise that they will be able to get loans for people, many or most of whom are quite desperate, get the money from those people and then never deliver on the loans.

The minister, I think, is aware of these practices. I think the minister has indicated publicly that she believes a solution rests with a legislative solution. She believes that it has to be the Legislature that deals with it. I think she's indicated to the public that she views this as a serious problem.

My question is this: Will you today commit to the House that we will see legislation on this matter in the House this session before we break for June?

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** Indeed the member is right; we have discussed this issue both in the House and we've discussed it personally as well. It is an issue. He's quite right in stating that I'm concerned about it.

The problem, as he knows, is that often hidden in very small print in the contract is a clause that says that people will not be refunded the amount of money they pay up front when they go to get the loan, when they sign on. Unfortunately, a lot of people are feeling quite desperate when they go to that length to get a loan.

We have put out a lot of consumer alerts. The media have done a great job in alerting people to this problem, and I am very grateful that they've been doing that. We will continue to put out media alerts and warn people that they should look very carefully before they sign these kinds of contracts and know what they're getting into.

Unfortunately, the government can't bring in bills to solve all the problems that exist out there in the marketplace. There are a number of ways that this could be dealt with. One is under the Mortgage Brokers Act, and we've discussed that, and there are some other consumer areas where it could be included. We are certainly looking at doing that. I cannot commit today to bring it into the House in this session.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Churley:** There is a possibility of doing this, but certainly it is a concern and we will continue to alert people. I thank you for raising the question today.

**Mr Phillips:** Without getting, I guess, too partisan on this thing, that really is bafflegab. You yourself, Minister, said this is a serious problem. You said it requires a legislative solution. You said people are getting ripped off, and there are literally hundreds of thousands of dollars ripped off some of the people who are in the most desperate straits in this province. There is no doubt about that. This is a last resort for people who are desperate for money, and you promised that you would bring forward legislation to deal with it.

I think what we're dealing with here, Premier, is that you have decided that you have a very limited legislative agenda, and yet your minister has said this is a significant problem that requires a legislative solution. You are leaving hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of people out to dry because you do not want to bring forward required legislation.

I'm trying to be helpful. I sent a letter to the government two months ago saying: "Listen, tell us if you're going to bring forward legislation. If you're not, we will prepare a private member's bill to deal with it." I have not even gotten an answer to that, and so my question is this: I am trying to solve the problem for the people who are being ripped off. Will you, at the very least, because you don't want to do anything, undertake to support a private member's bill by myself, designed to solve this problem and take it out of your hands, because you don't want to deal with it, and let the Legislature deal with this problem? Are you prepared today to support a private member's bill by myself to solve this problem?

**Hon Ms Churley:** I'd be very happy to look at the bill.

*Interjections.*

**Hon Ms Churley:** They want me to just say yes. Well, I can't say yes to something that I haven't seen. I'd be very interested to see what your private member's bill says and exactly what piece of legislation you're talking about amending and the implications of that, overall, to a whole bill.

I assume that you're talking about bringing in an amendment to an existing piece of legislation. I'd be very happy to take a look at it. When it's ready we can talk about it, and there's a possibility that I can support it. So we'll see. I presume that you're in the process of drafting this bill now. I look forward to seeing it and we can talk about it and see if indeed we can get support from the whole House to pass that bill.

#### TOURISM INDUSTRY

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation, and it's a positive and constructive suggestion which has emerged from our small business task force. Last week I had a meeting with the Elora Chamber of Commerce and I've received this letter since then:

"Dear Ted,

"Quebec has removed its sales tax on long-stay (two nights or more) accommodation. It would make an incredible difference to Ontario's hospitality industry, both absolutely and competitively, if Ontario did the same. Please try it."

It's signed by Tim Taylor, innkeeper of the Elora Mill Inn in Elora.

With the low Canadian dollar, now more than ever is the time to market Ontario to Americans as an attractive travel destination. One way of doing this is to ensure a level playing field with our provincial neighbours. Will you commit to removing the room and restaurant meal sales tax as Quebec has done on hotel packages involving extended stays of two nights or more?

**Hon Anne Swarbrick (Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation):** As the member knows, we've undertaken a very extensive industry-led consultation process over past months which resulted in a report to me recently as to what the industry in Ontario would like to see this government do to help really build the tourism industry and make it the globally competitive industry that it has the potential to be.

The report that I received in February is now undergoing the work for me to take to cabinet the key proposals presented to me by the Ontario industry, and I think it's the proposals of the Ontario industry throughout the consultations that involve more than 500 representatives of them that are the items that I need to be dealing with. That was not one of the key items that was raised by them.

1440

**Mr Arnott:** Tim Taylor was part of the consultation process which led to this report. This is a suggestion that he's put to us and I'm putting to you, and it has been two



months since this report was presented to you and you've indicated really that nothing's been done since that time.

It's very, very important, especially this year, as we're coming out of the recession and we see some life, that there be an important effort put forward to try and encourage Ontario as a tourism destination. What specific steps has the minister taken to implement the recommendations that were put to her two months ago?

**Hon Ms Swarbrick:** The industry understands very well what the process of our government is and the fact that you can't just immediately snap your fingers and come out with results, although they are very delighted at the fact that they know those results will be coming out in the very near future and beginning to, over the next number of months.

I should say that one of the advantages that the Quebec government has over the situation in Ontario is that the federal government, under both the present Liberal Party and under the past Conservative Party, has been extremely generous in Quebec. In the case of tourism, the federal government under the Conservatives, the party that the questioner is from, entered into a \$173-million joint agreement with the province of Quebec that has obviously allowed it to do a number of things that in Ontario we're having to go alone with.

Since the Liberal Party was elected federally, I've met with the federal minister responsible for tourism, the trade minister, John Manley, and made the case to him in terms of the fact that Ontario deserves the same kind of fair treatment that exists in Quebec. Unfortunately, the present Liberal Party is not willing to see that either. But the industry-led proposals presented to this government, which identify the priorities of the industry in Ontario—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Swarbrick:** —are very strongly being worked on, developed, and we'll be coming out with the clear proposals for action in the relatively near future.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** My question is for the Minister of Health. I realize the minister and the ministry are committed to maintaining and improving health care for all Ontarians and in particular for our seniors. One of the reforms that I'm most interested in is long-term care reform. I'm anxious about it, so is my community, so are district health councils, so are service providers, and so are the clients. We want to see this reform come in and take effect.

I would like to ask the minister for the seniors, because they want affordable, equitable and accessible services: Can the minister assure my constituents that this reform is forthcoming, and when can we expect it to take effect?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I'm delighted to be able to say to the member that indeed long-term care is already coming into effect and I know of the interest in her constituency and of the work that she has done to in fact help provide services for seniors in the riding of Perth.

Long-term care reform is well under way. We have already expanded the community-based services, such as

integrated homemaker, all across this province. That began to take effect last summer and last fall. Placement coordination services are now under development in 13 district health council areas where they were not in place in the past. And of course, as a result of Bill 101, which I know the member was part of that exercise in hearings and committee work, we now have reforms in the facility sector that have taken place.

In addition, of course, all of the district health councils have their long-term care planning committees in place and so I can safely reassure her that long-term care is well under way. There is more work to be done but we will complete that, I hope, in the near future.

**Mrs Haslam:** That brings me to one of the key elements of long-term care reform and that is the multi-service agencies. Since this one-stop access to long-term care was announced last fall, social health services, referral to other services, makes that multiservice agency the key in the development of the reformed system.

In my riding there are concerns about the multiservice agencies. I'm going to refer her to a letter from the Senior Citizens' Consumer Alliance for Long-Term Care Reform, where they say that "MSAs are simply existing agencies that are linked, merged or reorganized to provide the coordination of services that consumers want, in a streamlined and cost-efficient manner that taxpayers expect." That's from the senior citizens' alliance and they are in favour of an MSA but there are concerns, and we don't want to see another level of bureaucracy. It's not about a building and stones. I need to be assured that we are examining multiservice agencies—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mrs Haslam:** —and I need to be assured that we are going to be doing it right.

Could the minister assure me and my constituents that we are looking at it in a concerned way so that we don't rush into it, that we're doing it right?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** Let me say to the member that I certainly appreciate her understanding of what multi-service agencies are and are designed to be. As the seniors' consumers alliance has outlined, they are to be one-stop shopping where the consumers can get the services and the information they need. I regret that there has been some misinformation and misunderstanding that in fact they would be run by the government and somehow another level of bureaucracy. They will in fact be run by volunteer community boards, as are all the other transfer agencies within the Ministry of Health and other ministries, and will be providing that one-stop shopping using volunteers, bringing together existing services, coordinating and integrating the delivery of services.

As the member is well aware, Perth is one of our newer district health councils, but it got its long-term care planning committee established in the fall of 1993. Those committee meetings are open to the public, the planning is well under way, and Perth, as will other areas of the province, will soon be better served than it has ever been before with respect to the needs of seniors and those with physical disabilities.

## SERVICES FOR THE DISABLED

**Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex South):** My question is for the Health minister. My question is about ALPHA, Apartments for Living for Physically Handicapped Association, which owns and operates a non-profit housing project with attendant care in Windsor.

On December 1, 1993, the voluntary board of directors of ALPHA, because of concerns over your Bill 120, felt it necessary to terminate the care program, effective today. Since December, ALPHA has brought its concerns over the many serious concerns that it has in the transition issues to the attention of ministry officials. However, there's been no response from the government on these issues and they remain unresolved.

On Tuesday, ALPHA met with your colleague Dave Cooke and was given just 48 hours to resolve all the outstanding issues with the care provider, the Association for Persons with Physical Disabilities of Windsor and Essex County. At that meeting, the 12-member volunteer board said it couldn't solve these problems in just 48 hours and asked for a 30-day extension.

Minister, can you tell us today why your government refused to give ALPHA an extension to work things out?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I thank the member for his question, the first that I think he's had the opportunity to put to me.

I share very much his concern about the tenants of this supportive housing project in Windsor, and I know my colleague the member for Windsor-Riverside was in a meeting, as the member says. But I have to disagree with a lot of the premise of the member's question, because since ALPHA, which has been providing support services to those physically needy and disabled tenants in their building, announced that it wished to terminate the provision of those services, there have been innumerable meetings and attempts to negotiate a way in which the issue would be resolved.

The bottom line for me has to be, and continues to be, that the people living in those units who need 24-hour supervision and care be provided with that care. Another organization has emerged which is prepared to provide that care, and we have been trying to negotiate with ALPHA for the hand-over of the responsibilities ALPHA said it wished to end as of midnight tonight to another organization.

I am not aware of a request for an extension. That's the first that I've heard of it. I am not prepared to contemplate that, because the uncertainty and the difficulties for those tenants, who have got to be our primary concern, cannot be allowed to continue.

1450

**Mr Crozier:** Minister, perhaps Mr Cooke and you should get together. Perhaps your ministry officials who were at the meeting should speak with you. Perhaps officials from the Ministry of Housing should speak to you. I'm concerned that the signal you're sending to other volunteer organizations is that if they have legitimate concerns, you'll say to them: "We don't care about that. Give us the keys to the building and we'll take over."

It gets back to my question, Minister. In your letter of today, March 31, you say, "My staff remain committed to meeting with you to resolve outstanding issues regarding the termination of your tenant care program and we're prepared to discuss it at any time." But what you apparently aren't prepared to do is to give a volunteer organization, people who have to work all day, 30 days to work this out. Why couldn't you just give them 30 days?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I must caution the member. I must ask the member to go back over the chronology. I'll be more than happy to brief him and to show him. This has been an extremely serious situation in which the tenants have all appealed for intervention in order to give them the security and the care they must have for their very survival.

We have had enormous difficulty getting some definitive answers from ALPHA with respect to how we can make the transition it initiated and ensure that those tenants are protected. I can give him my guarantee that had phone calls been returned, had meetings been asked for—my staff have been on 24-hour alert to meet with ALPHA in an effort to prevent getting down to this deadline. We have no choice but to make sure that the tenants are protected. That's my responsibility and that's what I'm going to do.

## TRUANCY

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** I'd like to ask the Minister of Education and Training a question. Many of us have been concerned about violence in schools. He was on CFRB today talking about truancy in schools and our troubled youths. My question has to do with something the minister should be thinking about and acting on in the next few weeks and months. It's not new, but we haven't asked a question for two or three years because we thought something actually had been done. He's aware that in 1984 the Juvenile Delinquents Act was replaced by the Young Offenders Act.

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** That's federal.

**Mrs Cunningham:** Yes. He's also aware that the Education Act on truancy refers to the old Juvenile Delinquents Act, not to any new legislation. Even if it did, the judges would not have the kind of support in the existing legislation without an amendment to deal with these young people and assist them in a meaningful way. Over 20,000 youngsters are away from school habitually, and we don't have any tools in this province to help them in providing rehabilitation programs.

I'm asking the minister today, what are his plans to deal in some new way, as he's been given this information for a long time, with the habitual absence problem we face in our schools in Ontario?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** The issue the member raises is an important one, but not easily dealt with. I'm sure we would take a look at and talk about any suggestions she might have about what amendments might be necessary in legislation or other policy development that would be appropriate, because we're both committed to the same goal.



**Mrs Cunningham:** I do have some assistance for the minister. I have a brief on habitual absence that was presented to the former minister on January 12, 1991. This is very specific in its recommendation, that I would appreciate the minister look at.

Then we have a paper that was presented by the London Family Court Clinic, Dr Leschied, PhD, and Al Schnietter, BSW, "Understanding the Needs of School-Avoidant Youths," which is very specific.

Then I have a statement we made to the former government, the Liberal government, on July 12, 1989, which is very specific. It says, "Without an amended Young Offenders Act or the Ministry of Education making a decision about compulsory attendance, this problem is expected to escalate." When it comes to dealing with truants, there is absolute confusion. Some jurisdictions will not hear truancy cases at all. They say the legislation is not valid any more. What is needed is an amendment to the Education Act, specifically the sections here. I would just ask the minister if he would consider doing that in the next short while.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** I'd certainly like to review the documents the member has referred to, and I'd be glad to follow up with her.

#### WATER QUALITY

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** My question is for the Minister of Environment and Energy. Minister, as you know, there is a serious water problem in the Ballantrae-Musselman Lake area. I have been told of chloride problems. I've been told of nitrate problems. In the Ballantrae-Musselman Lake area of my riding they're really concerned. The hundreds of families in that area are relying right now on bottled water and some wells that are polluted. I'm really concerned about the health of these people. Can you tell me what your ministry is doing for me, to help me and the constituents in my riding to get safe water? They need to get it. It's important.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** Thanks to the lobbying on behalf of his constituents who have had to endure this long-standing problem, the member for Durham-York will know that the Ontario Clean Water Agency, when it made its recent announcements of allocations, allocated I think a total of \$13 million to Durham-York for projects. Specifically, dealing with the Musselman Lake area, the Ballantrae communal water supply source, the grant proposed is \$2.4 million; the Ballantrae communal water system, the facility, is another \$2.3 million; and the Musselman Lake communal water distribution system allocation is \$2.8 million, for a total allocation, thanks to the work of the member for Durham-York to deal with this problem, of \$7.5 million. We're looking forward to the municipality taking advantage of this so finally the people who have had to endure this problem for so long and be dependent on bottled water will have safe, clean drinking water for their communities.

**Mr O'Connor:** Minister, you'll know I appreciate that, and I was part of the announcement of the grants that took place back in February from OCWA. But what my constituents are worried about is that they've got this water problem, and what do they do next? What's the

process? Where are they supposed to go? The town is a little slow in reacting. Just what is the process? What do my constituents have to do next?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I must say that I recognize the urgency of the problem the member brings before the House, but it's only fair to point out that the council of the municipality has to consider the offer of this substantial grant from the Ontario Clean Water Agency to determine how it might be able to provide its share of the cost. I'm sure, if ratepayers are concerned, they would be welcome to attend a council meeting and make their views known. I look forward to the council making a decision as to whether it is prepared to participate so that this long-standing problem can be resolved as the member's constituents wish it to be.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS CODE REVIEW

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** My question is to the minister responsible for the Human Rights Commission. Madam Minister, when will you be introducing legislative reform to the Human Rights Code?

**Hon Elaine Ziemba (Minister Responsible for Human Rights, Disability Issues, Seniors' Issues and Race Relations):** I'm sorry, Mr Speaker, I was unable to hear the question. Could you please repeat it?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member repeat the question, please.

**Mr Curling:** I'll say it slowly. When will you be introducing legislative reform to the Human Rights Code?

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** In answer to the critic's question, I would say we are now reviewing the possibility of procedural amendments to the code. We're also reviewing some other aspects to the Human Rights Code. When we finish that review, we will certainly include him in a briefing, as we have done on all other occasions, and will tell him the type of legislation we might or might not be introducing.

**Mr Curling:** It is evident that human rights is not a priority of this minister or this New Democratic Party government. Not only did she not answer my question—I didn't ask her for any more briefings—but she has ignored responding to the legislative reforms that were called for by the Human Rights people and advocates themselves; by the coroner's report, which has asked for reform; by the Ombudsman of this province, who will tell you that Human Rights Commission cannot continue, cannot be effective unless you have changes to the legislation. There is a backlog there, and of those waiting for tribunal hearings.

1500

Madam Minister, the priority of your government is not human rights; it doesn't seem so to me. I'm going to ask you again and give you this opportunity: Not when I want a briefing, not when you get a chance to read the coroner's report—when will you be introducing some sort of legislation to the Human Rights Code?

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** First of all, I want to make very clear to the member opposite our commitment to extending human rights and to making sure that this province is a fair and equitable society.

There are many different ways of reforming the

Human Rights Code and making sure that people's rights are enshrined. I just want to name a number of initiatives we have been able to accomplish.

We have eliminated the backlog, save for a few cases, that were before that government since 1985. There are about 15 cases that are still outstanding and will be resolved by May. We have also made sure that as we proceed with the new cases, we come to an early settlement—

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I have a case that's been there for six years.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** —arising out of making sure that people can accomplish—

**Mrs Marland:** Six years, and it's still not resolved.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** Mr Speaker, I'm having difficulty with the members opposite. That's why I couldn't hear the member's question at first. The same person who the other day criticized the speaking in the House is now making a lot of comments.

**Mrs Marland:** No, I'm only making one comment. I have a case that's six years old.

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for Mississauga South.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** We have also made sure that the cases that are coming in, the new cases, are resolved in a quick and efficient manner: 60% of the cases that come before the Human Rights Commission are resolved within six months. That's a wonderful record.

We have also made sure that we have trained the staff. The staff were never trained before under the previous two governments—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** —and that staff is now trained and can make sure they respond in an efficient manner.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** There is one last point I want to make. We believe in human rights, and we believe in making sure that all aspects of human rights are at the forefront of our priority list. We passed employment equity, Bill 79, last December. Neither of those two parties, especially that member, voted for employment equity. That is a component—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister please conclude her response.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** —of human rights and dignity in the workplace.

#### CLOSING OF CAMPGROUND

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I'm sure you'll be that generous with me, Mr Speaker. I have a question for the minister responsible for tourism.

In eastern Ontario, the St Lawrence Parks Commission made a decision a few years ago to close a number of parks along the St Lawrence system. Members representing those ridings have been urging the parks commission and your government to take a look at that decision and

open those parks up for private sector operation through long-term lease agreements. So far only one has occurred, and that is operating extremely successfully, turning a significant profit, unlike when it was operated by a government agency.

These parks are some of the most beautiful vistas and waterfront property along the system. They're sitting vacant; they're sitting idle. What's your government's position in respect to getting these beautiful parks in operation once again?

**Hon Anne Swarbrick (Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation):** I appreciate the concern on behalf of eastern Ontario being put forward by the member from that area. It's an area that both my parliamentary assistant and I have been addressing. It's not an easy solution to arrive at. It's a complicated situation that involves the contracting-out of facilities that were once operated by union employees. It also is an area of wanting to make sure we're not trying to single-source the leasing of those parks, which in fact is what's often been advocated by people who've come forward from that area.

**Mr Runciman:** That's a sad commentary on tourism policy in this province. Those parks have been sitting vacant for several years now, and the minister gets up and says it's a difficult problem. If she were really committed to encouraging and developing tourism in eastern Ontario, she could act in this matter quickly. She could act on it today; she could act on it tomorrow and resolve the situation.

We're talking about jobs. We're talking about a significant boost to the economy in eastern Ontario. This is not a difficult question to deal with.

She can open those facilities to private sector opportunities very quickly. We can have them in operation, some of them, this summer. All she has to do away with is successor rights and make those properties available. We have an opportunity to develop a golf course in one in my riding.

I urge the minister to look at this closely, immediately, and take action and do something for tourism development in eastern Ontario.

**Hon Ms Swarbrick:** If the member and others have proposals for the development of a golf course there, I'm sure the St Lawrence Parks Commission would be happy to hear about it. That's a totally different issue than the parks.

Certainly I intend to continue working on this issue. However, I would point out that there has not been a problem of people having to be turned away from parks in that area. It's not as though there is a problem of undercapacity. I do appreciate, however, that it's something I will continue to pay attention to in an attempt to try to resolve the issue.

#### RACIAL HARMONY

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** My question is for the Minister of Citizenship, who is also responsible for the Anti-Racism Secretariat. In our community—frankly, this is my neighbour's riding of Oshawa—there have been some very disturbing events recently. Some slogans have been posted in regard to a



very right-wing group, the NSDAP, and the Heritage Front pasting nasty, racist, very disturbing slogans.

Minister, first off, I want to know what the Anti-Racism Secretariat is doing in our area to combat this kind of very disturbing and racist propaganda.

**Hon Elaine Ziemba (Minister of Citizenship and Minister Responsible for Human Rights, Disability Issues, Seniors' Issues and Race Relations):** I know the member has worked very hard in his community to make a very favourable environment for all our citizens in Ontario, and I congratulate him for his efforts. I share his concerns, as we all do in this House, when people who live in our communities are targeted by other individuals who are hatemongering, as we call it.

In the member's own community, we have been able to give his community groups grants. One is the black women's organization. Also the intercommunity organization has been working very hard with our ministry, the Ontario Anti-Racism Secretariat and community groups to make sure we eliminate racism and discrimination.

Just one final word: The Ontario Anti-Racism Secretariat is very committed to making sure we all work together to fight racism, to fight all forms of discrimination so we can have a more harmonious society.

#### MOTIONS

##### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that Mr Jamison and Ms Murdock (Sudbury) exchange places in the order of precedence for private members' public business.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

#### PETITIONS

##### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I have a petition in favour of Bill 45.

"Whereas the private member's bill on same-sex benefits known as Bill 45, introduced by Tim Murphy, MPP for St George-St David, is awaiting third reading approval in the Legislature;

"Whereas we, the undersigned, are disappointed by the lack of action by the government on introducing legislation that would eliminate all discrimination against gays and lesbians;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to take action on this issue and ensure that legislation such as Bill 45 is passed which will ensure all couples are treated equally under the law."

I affix my signature in support.

##### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition addressed to Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and 'grandfathered' those of us who have already taken safety course and/or hunted for years (we are not unsafe and we're not criminals); and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time to pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about the classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearm owners and hunters, and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearm safety course or examination."

I have signed my signature to identify this petition.

1510

##### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I have a petition here addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It's from many concerned community residents in my area and across the province. It reads:

"Whereas Bill 21, Mr Wessenger's bill, has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by actions of their landlords;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading and implementation of Bill 21."

##### VIOLENCE

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I have 15 further petitions from the towns of Bowmanville, Cavan, Millbrook, Newcastle, Oshawa and Newtonville concerning serial killer trading cards, and I'd like to read the petition to you.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;

"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to emulate or admire, but rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is

restricted to people over the age of 18 years, and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

I've signed this petition since I thoroughly agree with it, and I will tell you that brings to 1,304 signatures this week on petitions in this regard from Catholic women's leagues, women's institutes and business and professional women's clubs.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Further petitions? The member for Leeds-Grenville.

#### POLICE USE OF FORCE

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** Thank you for recognizing me, Madam Speaker. I truly appreciate it.

I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, signed by 6,930 residents of Sault Ste Marie, and this was circulated for only five weeks.

"Whereas a concerned citizens' group has been formed in Sault Ste Marie, Citizens Offering Police Support (COPS) oppose the board of inquiry's decision of August 5, 1993, in the Trepasso v Lindsay case. COPS is endorsed by the Sault Ste Marie Drinking and Driving Awareness Committee.

"Whereas this board of inquiry's mandate is to determine if Constable Steven Lindsay's use of force is justifiable. The only two people who can testify to this event are Mr Larry Trepasso and Constable Steven Lindsay. The board prefers the testimony of Mr Larry Trepasso, whose blood alcohol levels tested at 0.153 milligrams and 0.145 milligrams, well over the legal limit of 0.08. Constable Steven Lindsay, a police officer with an impeccable record, was not believed.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We demand the board of inquiry's decision of August 5, 1993, in the Trepasso v Lindsay case be rescinded, or at a very minimum be reviewed by a new board."

I am affixing my signature in support of this petition.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Noel Duignan (Halton North):** I have a petition on behalf of the Maple Avenue Baptist Church of Maple Avenue in Georgetown. It's addressed to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, but since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all references to sexual orientation should be removed

from the Ontario Human Rights Code and Bill 45.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a petition to Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years (we are not unsafe and we are not criminals); and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearm owners and hunters, and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearm safety course or examination."

That has been signed by hundreds of concerned members of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters.

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas several patients from the town of New Tecumseth are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments in Orillia or Toronto;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in New Tecumseth and one patient is forced to pay for her own nurse;

"Whereas the government continues to insist that they are studying the problem, even though they have known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in New Tecumseth and Collingwood;

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of New Tecumseth."

That's a continuation of the petition that is signed by thousands of people from my riding and surrounding areas, and I've signed this petition.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative"—



**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** You did this yesterday.

**Mr Mills:** And I'll do it and I'll keep on doing it all the time they mess around with it over there.

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile homes by the action of their landlord;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:"

I hope the member, the critic for the Conservatives, has listened.

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

I'm going to sign that.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario and it reads as follows:

"Whereas Bill 45 seeks to remove from subsection 10(1) of the Human Rights Code 'of the opposite sex' which would allow for two people of the same sex to be legally married; and

"Whereas Bill 55 in section 7(1) includes sexual orientation against which no public statement shall be permitted under section 26(1) and that sexual orientation may include homosexuality;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To maintain the requirement that marriages are constituted between two people of the opposite sex. This requirement preserves what has been naturally proper as long as marriages have taken place, thus upholding the traditional fruitful family unit as set forth in holy scripture while abating the unfruitful, unnatural perverseness of homosexuality.

"To this we add that 'sexual orientation' be removed from section 7(1) as proposed by Bill 45. It is admitted that no legitimate discrimination could be brought against an individual solely on the basis of any of the points stated in section 7(1) except sexual orientation.

"In so far as sexual orientation refers to homosexuality we have no concern. However, in so far as 'sexual orientation' may refer to homosexuality, Bill 55 contradicts our responsibility as Christians to publicly proclaim the truth: We must, according as we believe from the Scriptures, reject homosexuality as an 'abomination,' Leviticus 18:22, and error, Romans 1:27."

1520

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Gary Wilson (Kingston and The Islands):** I have a petition to Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and hunted for years (we are not unsafe and we are not criminals); and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearm owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

That's signed by about 130 people.

#### LANDFILL

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the recent announcement by the NDP government to choose three superdumps within the greater Toronto area has disturbed and upset local residents; and

"Whereas these superdumps might have been prevented if Bill 143 had allowed the Interim Waste Authority to look at all alternatives during the site selection process; and

"Whereas we would like to ensure the province of Ontario is making the best decision based on all the facts regarding incineration and long rail-haul and garbage management;

"We demand that the NDP government of Ontario repeal Bill 143, disband the IWA and place a moratorium on the process of finding a landfill to serve all of the greater Toronto area until all alternatives can be properly studied and debated."

I have identified this petition and signed it.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario on behalf of my constituents, the residents at Twin Elms in Strathroy, who petition the government:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide much-needed protection to the owners of mobile homes and mobile home trailer parks and the owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile homes," and that includes the seniors at Twin Elms;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

I have indeed signed my name to this most worthy petition.

## SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition of 87 signatures from constituents from my riding. It's addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas traditional family values that recognize marriage as a union between a man and a woman are under attack by Liberal MPP Tim Murphy and his private member's Bill 45; and

"Whereas this bill would recognize same-sex couples and extend to them all the same rights as heterosexual couples; and

"Whereas the bill was carried with the support of an NDP and Liberal majority, but with no PC support in the second reading debate on June 24, 1993; and

"Whereas this bill is currently with the legislative committee on administration of justice and is being readied for a quick passage in the Legislature; and

"Whereas this bill has not been fully examined for financial and societal implications;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to stop this bill and future bills which would grant same-sex couples the right to marry and to consider its impact on families in Ontario."

I have signed this petition.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, the orders that I wish to call first are 114 through 117, which are four private bills that were reported out of the private bills committee. I believe we have the consent of the opposition to deal with both second and third readings of those bills this afternoon.

## TOWNSHIP OF GLANBROOK ACT, 1993

On motion by Mr Morrow, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr63, An Act respecting the Township of Glanbrook.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

TOWNSHIP OF HURON AND  
VILLAGE OF RIPLEY ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Curling, on behalf of Mr Elston, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr78, An Act respecting the Township of Huron and the Village of Ripley.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

## TOWN OF BOTHWELL ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Hope, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr89, An Act respecting the Town of Bothwell.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

## CITY OF KINGSTON ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Gary Wilson, the following bill was given second reading:

Bill Pr91, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

1530

## INTERIM SUPPLY

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for

interim supply for the period commencing April 1, 1994, and ending July 31, 1994.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** We will now resume the debate.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Just before we start the debate, the opposition House leaders and I had some discussions earlier and I believe there's been an agreement that the two opposition parties will split the remaining time between now and 6 o'clock on this debate and that the debate will then end and be dealt with appropriately.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is it agreed? Agreed.

The member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor.

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** Can I ask the Chair what the division of time is?

**The Acting Speaker:** I'll ask the clerk.

That would be one hour and 15 minutes for each party.

**Mr Runciman:** All right. Thank you very much.

It's a pleasure to participate in this debate in respect to interim supply, but I also want to comment briefly in respect to some comments made by the deputy leader of the Liberal Party, who preceded me in this debate and made some rather negative comments, to be polite, in respect to the leader of my party, Michael Harris, my colleague from Markham, Mr Cousins, and the Conservative Party of Ontario generally.

I wasn't surprised by the nature of the deputy leader of the Liberal Party's comments. I think he epitomizes a sore loser. They were very arrogant, condescending and typical of a very bitter individual. I would describe it as a venal outburst and an insult, not only to the voters of Victoria-Haliburton but to all Ontarians.

The reality is, of course, in the by-election in Victoria-Haliburton, when that by-election was called, the Liberal Party was leading in the polls by approximately 28 points and felt that it was a very easy cakewalk for the Liberal Party in respect to winning that by-election. Of course the result was somewhat different than the earlier polls indicated, with our candidate, an outstanding candidate, Mr Chris Hodgson, winning with 51% of the vote, the Liberal Party garnering 41% and the NDP 6%.

On the night of the by-election, Mr Conway, the deputy leader of the Liberal Party, the member for Renfrew North, appeared on television, and again this was a very, in my view, outrageous outburst. His holier-than-thou rhetoric we're familiar with, but again, I think it was unbefitting of a leading member of the Liberal Party of Ontario.

But again I want to put on the record that this wasn't a surprise, because after the 1990 election—certainly all of us in this House can recall when the Liberals called the election, Mr Peterson called the election, the Liberals were leading significantly in the polls, with something like 51% or 52%, and this was a very opportunistic call. They knew their positioning in the polls. They knew we were entering into some very difficult economic times, and they did, in an unprecedented fashion, call an election in only the third year of their mandate with a majority government. Of course on that occasion we saw



the polls turn rather dramatically and the NDP form a majority government.

Following that election result, Mr Conway, who at that time was not the deputy leader—he had been replaced, I believe, by Mr Nixon—still reacted in a somewhat comparable manner. He could not take the result. He could not live with the result. He disappeared from this chamber for close to a year, would not participate. In fact, I think he spent several months in the Far East while still drawing a salary from the taxpayers. But that's the sort of individual we're dealing with.

No doubt he is a very eloquent and intelligent man, and we will all grant him that, but he frequently portrays what the Liberal government portrayed in government, and that indeed is condescension and arrogance, and again, as I said, indicated in his outburst here yesterday, an insult to the voters, not only of Victoria-Haliburton but across the province.

What he's saying is that we can't talk about rather controversial issues unless we get the approval of the Liberal Party or the NDP or the so-called politically correct in this province. Of course I think they didn't get the message in the last federal election, where people across this country were sick and tired of political parties and political representatives not speaking up for them in legislatures and in the House of Parliament.

We often saw in the past, and we've seen it in this assembly as well, where all three parties on controversial issues sing from the same hymn book. A significant number of Ontarians and Canadians were not having their views spoken in the Legislature or the House of Parliament. They may be controversial views, they may be views that many disagree with, but they are views that are held, and honestly held, by Ontarians and Canadians and they have a right, they have every right to be heard. In many instances in the past, that simply wasn't occurring. We had the élite, the politically correct, the holier-than-thou like the deputy leader of the Liberal Party saying that we should not be raising those kinds of issues because they were divisive, they were generators of hatred etc.

But the irony of all of this, in fact the hypocrisy of all of this was that when this issue—and we're talking about the specific issue of benefits for same-sex spouses. That's the issue the deputy leader was saying the Conservative Party should not have raised in Victoria-Haliburton, but it was okay for the Liberal Party to raise that same issue in St George-St David. That is the irony of this and the hypocrisy that we've heard so often in this chamber and in the federal House. They were on one side where they could garner votes in respect to a very significant gay and lesbian population in St George-St David, so they took a very activist role in talking about this issue, in raising the profile of this issue because it would benefit them in a political way.

Their leader made some very strong statements in that respect, the NDP made some strong statements in that respect and so did the Conservative candidate, and that's fair ball. There's nothing wrong with that, but when the same issue was raised in Victoria-Haliburton, where it was not necessarily politically popular, all of a sudden

it's a generator of hatred; it's a generator of division. In other words, "We could raise these kinds of issues when it's okay for us politically, but when it's okay for someone else politically, it's totally inappropriate, it's not politically correct, it's divisive, it's a generator of hatred." We don't accept that and we don't accept this approach to excluding the views of Ontarians on controversial issues.

I think if Mr Conway had his way and the Liberal Party of Ontario had its way, the petitions that we're hearing right in this House in respect to Bill 45, Mr Murphy's bill, espousing the extension of spousal benefits to same-sex couples, Mr Conway wouldn't even want those petitions heard. I suspect that's the case, because it disagrees with a position of his and many in his party and he simply can't abide by that.

I think that's totally inappropriate and not in keeping with the view of most voters and most residents of this province. I don't care who agrees or disagrees. They have a right to be heard. A significant portion of Ontarians have concerns about this particular issue, and they have a right to be heard. In fact, I suspect significant numbers of the NDP caucus have concerns about this kind of initiative and probably some members of the Liberal Party of Ontario have concerns, and they have a right to be heard.

I want to talk about this issue in the sense that the Liberal Party has suggested that this issue shouldn't have been raised and that we were playing dirty politics by raising what I consider to be a legitimate issue.

Prior to this advertisement appearing in Victoria-Haliburton outlining the positions of the three parties on the same-sex benefits question, the campaigners for the Liberal Party were phoning around the riding of Victoria-Haliburton saying that Chris Hodgson, the Conservative candidate, was the Mulroney candidate. Chris Hodgson, a provincial Ontario Conservative member, was being described by the Liberal campaign team as the Mulroney candidate. That's fair ball, from the Liberal Party's perspective. But to raise a legitimate issue, a position of the political parties which is on the record, is not. That's not fair ball.

Give me a break and give the voters of Victoria-Haliburton a break and give them some credit. All that ad said and all our candidates' position was in respect to that was that this is a priority. Spousal benefits for same-sex couples is a priority of the NDP and it's a priority of the Liberal Party. Can you question that? Apparently the deputy leader was suggesting that wasn't accurate.

We know that during the by-election campaign Marion Boyd, the current Attorney General, indicated that the NDP at the first opportunity was going to bring in spousal benefits for same-sex couples, clearly a priority of the NDP.

1540

Where does the Liberal Party stand on this? In March 1993, Lyn McLeod, the leader of the Ontario Liberal Party, sent an urgent message to the Premier of Ontario and to the Attorney General, Marion Boyd. I won't read all of this letter from Lyn McLeod, the leader of the

Liberal Party, but I just want to put a couple of the important quotes into the record:

"Dear Premier and Attorney General:"

"I am writing to urge your government to act on the issue of the extension of family and survivor benefits to same-sex couples. If you will agree to bring legislation forward immediately, I will do everything possible to facilitate passage. If you do not act, please be assured that a future Liberal government will move swiftly to take the action which I am requesting you take immediately."

That's Lyn McLeod saying to move on this immediately. Despite the state of the economy, despite the deteriorating job market situation, Lyn McLeod was saying: "Premier, this should be your number one priority. Move on it immediately."

So what did Chris Hodgson's advertising say in Victoria-Haliburton? He said this is a priority of the Liberal Party; it's backed up by correspondence from the leader of the Liberal Party. Clearly it is a major priority for the Liberal Party, and we knew it was for the NDP because Marion Boyd, the Attorney General, said it was. So what was dishonest about that ad? Absolutely nothing.

We pointed to the position taken by Mrs Boyd, the Attorney General, and by Lyn McLeod, and we said clearly this was not a priority of the Ontario Conservative Party. Our priority is the creation of jobs and returning the Ontario economy to the great state it was in 10 years ago. That was our priority and we were dragged through the coals and smeared upon by the deputy leader of the Ontario Liberal Party because we dared to raise a legitimate issue during a by-election campaign where it was detrimental to the Liberal Party of Ontario. That's the sole reason. He can get up with his holier-than-thou, condescending attitude and condemn not only the Conservative Party but Michael Harris and my friend and colleague Don Cousens without any merit or justification in a real way, in a real sense.

That is deeply offensive not only to me and members of the Conservative Party of Ontario but certainly to the voters of Victoria-Haliburton, regardless of whether they voted for the Conservative candidate or the Liberal candidate or the NDP candidate; very insulting, degrading and certainly unbecoming of a senior member of the Liberal Party of Ontario.

The reality is that during that by-election campaign there were a significant number of issues addressed and we had an outstanding candidate in Chris Hodgson, as you will all get to know in the next week and months ahead. He had an outstanding organization. They worked very hard to succeed in this election campaign. Michael Harris went into that riding and was very successful in terms of his appearances. We were told—I can't back this up—by people within the riding that any time Lyn McLeod visited, our candidate went up about four or five points in the polls.

So you judge, Madam Speaker, whether the people of Victoria-Haliburton made this decision on this sole issue or not. I don't think they did. They made it on the basis of leadership, they made it on the basis of the candidate,

they made it on the basis of a wide range of issues important to them. One of those issues that was not important to them was one that was important to the Liberal Party of Ontario and to the élite within the NDP.

**Mr David Wininger (London South):** You placed the ad.

**Mr Runciman:** No apology for placing that ad. It was a legitimate ad about a legitimate issue that requires debate and requires discussion and should not be hidden from the people of Ontario.

I want to talk about a few issues related to interim supply, now that I've gotten that off my chest. I felt that Mr Conway's diatribe could not go unanswered.

We are in a significant financial problem, as virtually everyone in this assembly and everyone in this province is aware. We've seen the deficit increase significantly and we know that initially the NDP was misled by the outgoing government, the Liberal government, and the Treasurer of the day, Robert Nixon, when, prior to the election, they said that they were going to have a \$50-million deficit and then midway into the campaign said it was going to be a little higher than that, I think. Then they got to open the books and found out that the province was in significant difficulty indeed.

But, of course, rather than recognizing how grave the situation was, the NDP made the situation even worse by continuing the Liberal spending binge and creating difficulties which it can now not recover from apparently, or is not prepared from a political perspective in terms of endangering its own core of supporters—traditional supporters, in any event—by taking corrective steps that are clearly necessary.

The debt, at last count, was closing in on \$80 billion. In the neighbourhood of four years in office the NDP will have doubled the provincial debt.

We now have in this province, according to Maclean's magazine, approximately 574,000 unemployed people. That's 10.7%. But perhaps an even more important figure is the number of people on welfare who are collecting social assistance benefits: 1.3 million Ontarians. Close to 20% of the Ontario population is on some form of public social assistance, and that's frightening indeed.

I heard the member for London South yesterday, in one of the responses, talking about the creation of jobs and the track record that the current government has in respect to the creation of new jobs. There's an old argument that you have to take a look at what the net jobs are. You're creating jobs by spending tax dollars and government dollars, but by taxing and imposing all sorts of additional costs on businesses and industry and individuals, you are losing jobs as well.

On the one hand, you can get up and say that we are creating 300,000 jobs through an infrastructure program, through Jobs Ontario, what have you, but you're not measuring, on the other side of it, the number of jobs that are being lost, the number of jobs that are not being created because of the disincentives of increased taxation—and we've seen record tax increases by this government—and all of the other host of costs that they've implemented through a variety of measures:



licence fees, inspection fees, what have you.

It's a hollow argument to get up and say, "We have created x number of jobs," because in reality we have to take some sort of measurement of what the net picture is, and we're not getting that from the representatives of the government. Of course, if you take a look at the unemployment statistics and take a look at the welfare statistics, in terms of the net creation of jobs in this province it would clearly appear that we're on the negative side of that equation.

Of course, a number of the things that the minister responsible for human rights was talking about here earlier with great glee—employment equity etc—are some of the measures that are hurting the creation of jobs and the growth of employment in this province. There are steps that they've taken, like their commitment to increase the minimum wage.

I want to say that the minimum wage is in many respects a job killer. I see it in my riding, which is heavily dependent on tourism. By elevating the minimum wage to the levels that this government has already elevated it to and committing to further increases, it is a killer of youth jobs essentially. Young people are having fewer and fewer opportunities to get into the market. If you talk to anyone in the tourism business, they will tell you that the minimum wage is an important factor in terms of their inability or unwillingness to hire young people into summer and part-time jobs. It has a significant detrimental impact on entry-level jobs and, perhaps even more importantly, a negative impact on career prospects for these young people over the long haul.

1550

I want to talk briefly about the situation the government inherited from the Liberals, but I also want to talk somewhat about the situation the Liberals inherited from the Ontario Conservatives after 42 years. Most of us in this assembly grew up living with a Conservative government in Ontario. Those were pretty good years in Ontario. Not everything was perfect. I won't deny there were problems and difficulties, but I think by and large when we looked at education, when we looked at health care and we looked at the economy and the environment, Ontario was a much better place to be living in.

We can all ask the question of ourselves and of others living in Ontario now: Are you better off than you were 10 years ago? Are you better off? Is your family better off? Are your children and grandchildren going to have the same kinds of opportunities and prospects that you and your children had 10 or 15 years ago?

It's my hope that Ontarians will keep that in mind whenever we go to the polls within the next 12 to 14 months. This government is having a tough time coming to grips with many issues. It's a tough problem to try to convince people to make sacrifices, and that's really what government's role is, in many respects, nowadays. It's difficult to encourage people to make those sacrifices, and the political sacrifices you have to make as well, especially when the bankers and the credit lines are still open and the demands from the special-interest groups across this province and across this country are still very loud indeed.

I'm not sure about my time. Was it one hour and 15 minutes? I have gone about 22 minutes.

**The Acting Speaker:** You have 53 minutes remaining.

**Mr Runciman:** All right. I'll quickly say a number of things about the former Liberal government, hopefully reminding Ontarians about the options coming up in the next election.

If you look at the problems with the Workers' Compensation Board currently, many of those problems were created by the Liberal government of Ontario. They increased compensation payouts. The payouts in Ontario now are so significantly higher than other provinces, and again this puts us at a competitive disadvantage. If you look at the average payout last year in Ontario to a claimant, I believe it was over \$24,000 per year. The closest jurisdiction to Ontario was New Brunswick, with something like \$14,000 per claimant on an annual basis. That's a difference that Ontario employers in industry, small business, shouldn't have to live with and certainly, in my view, can't continue to live with. A lot of that has to be laid at the doorstep of the Liberal Party of Ontario as well as the current NDP government.

Take a look at the employer health tax brought in by the Liberal government—a job killer. Take a look at tax increases. The Liberals brought in 33 new taxes during their five years in office. They also posed a phoney deficit figure to the electorate prior to the 1990 election.

In terms of the concerns we heard from the member for Mississauga West last week about the current government spending \$95 a night to house some of its bureaucrats to take a seminar, they have to be constantly reminded, and the electorate have to be constantly reminded, of the high livers who are in the Ontario Liberal cabinet going to Italy, for example, and spending \$1,200 to \$1,400 a night for hotel rooms in Rome: Monte Kwinter, David Peterson—you can go on and on about the folks who lived high on the hog at taxpayers' expense during the Liberal years.

We can also remind them, when they start talking about ethics in government, about Patti Starr, a key player in the Liberal government. We can talk about Wilf Caplan and his involvement with the Wyda corporation and the Ontario Development Corp, and the fact that Ms Caplan had to step down from cabinet during that discussion. When we talk about ethics, the Liberal Party of Ontario should be constantly reminded about those kinds of ethical questions.

The reality is that the last nine years or so, 10 years, have been in effect a lost decade for Ontario. The only way we're going to turn that around is through the election of Mike Harris as Premier, an Ontario Conservative government committed to smarter and fairer government for all the people of Ontario.

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** As the previous speaker from the Conservative Party was speaking, I was tempted to comment on what he said, but it would be just a waste of time, because we're talking about interim supply.

In the short time we have here, I'll try to focus on

some of the things we are feeling as a people, especially in my constituency of Scarborough North, which is quite representative of Ontario. I'm not quite sure how the Conservative Party sees the representation of this province, but it's a rather inclusive province of all people, regardless of status, income, colour, class, creed or religion. That's what the Liberal Party is trying to achieve in governing.

Sometimes we have to spread the wealth around a bit. The Conservative Party feels that only certain people must gather this wealth, and then the crumbs as they fall off the table will be given to those who are hanging around. But the Liberal Party believes in distributing the wealth and making everyone enjoy some of what we have.

But what we have today are tough times, recessionary times. Of course, as parliamentarians we may stand across from each other or beside each other and throw the blame all over, say it may be the Conservatives who handed this baton to us, the Liberals, or when we handed it over to the NDP, that has really destroyed the economy. Of course, as Liberals in the opposition we try to prove that.

But who suffers under all this? The people. People suffer under those problems we have. In Scarborough itself, which has almost half a million people, they are feeling it hard. There are people who have small businesses who have gone bankrupt, people who have lost their jobs, people who have lost their homes, and they're feeling it. They're looking to government for responsible governing.

As we talk about interim supply and the Treasurer comes to us and says, "It's time to pay the civil servants and pay the other debts out," some of those who can't even get a payday are wondering when their payday will come in. So they are concerned.

This government has tried to bring in new policies, and I want to commend it for that. I want to commend them for bringing in some new ideas like a social contract in order to say, "Let us all share some of this pain; let us all see if we can dip into our pockets and find out whether we can redistribute some of that wealth," or some of us who are unfortunate may be able to get something in their pocket to pay their mortgage, or to get some other program started.

As you know, the Liberal Party voted against that. I fully agree with why they voted against that. The Conservative Party voted for that, and I commend them for doing that. We thought about it very much in caucus, debated it, analysed it, and realized it was flawed, that it would not achieve the things it intended to do. I would say that is exactly what is happening today. You would agree with me that even today the Premier, I understand, is trying to renegotiate the social contract with some of the union members, to say, "Did we hit you too hard? Did we go against some collective bargaining agreements that we held so noble in our policies in the past?"

The problem is that people felt, "While I have had those pains, have given out as much as I could, now you're asking to give some more." We knew and were telling you all along that the unions would be very upset

with your party when the social contract came in. They saw some of the things the Liberal Party had seen.

As I say, while it had good intentions, it somehow got a couple of punctures and is not getting to the destination it should. It is sad that this is happening.

1600

It was the same way when they tried to do the employment equity problem. It's good stuff—employment equity has to happen in this province—but again I and my party voted against that because we saw it wasn't going to get to the goal and wasn't going to achieve the things it should achieve.

I want to speak today about the hurting people in this recession, the people who have felt this recession more than anyone else. Some people tell me they have thrived, very much so, in this recession, that it has not affected them at all. I'm not going to address those people. They are resilient enough and have enough resources already that they are riding through this recession. They may come out, but some get hurt: the unemployed, the hurting people, the loss of income, as I stated before.

That loss of income has brought about what I see every Friday when I go to my constituency office. Constituents were coming to me and said: "I am losing my home, and the bank is too severe with me because I can't find the money for the mortgage. My husband has lost his job" or "my wife has lost her job, and we depended so much on both incomes to carry us through." What has happened is that the pride has gone out of that family because the father or the mother, the parents, are unable to give that support to the child or children within that family because there is no income coming in.

The government has cut unemployment benefits and made it worse. There was need in that family, and that need and the lack of income have brought about the real sorrow those families have to face.

The hurting people: the students. While we're saying there will be no tax increase in this province, this government, in its short time, has increased taxes more than any other government. The government has to spend on programs. Yes, they have to get the money from somewhere, so therefore they've increased taxes.

What they have announced in the last couple of days since they came back to Parliament is rather shocking. They have announced, first, which we welcome, no new taxes. Transfer payments will not be decreased, and the municipal governments applauded that because of course they have to carry out their programs and depend on the province to give that money.

But what has happened? The hurting people, the students, have now been hit with a 20% increase. Of course they said, "Listen, we're only going to give you a 10% increase now." Just follow this through: Most students will have gotten some of their money from their parents or from jobs in the summer to supplement their tuition fees. Now they have been hit with a 10% increase. Where are they going to get this money? Parents are not working, they themselves cannot get a job because the unemployment rate has increased, and now they have to find a 10% increase.



The irony of all this, and I know you recall, Mr Speaker, is that this government, the New Democratic Party government, on coming into power stated: "We shall eliminate all tuition fees. That is our goal." I really felt great. I said to myself, "I wish my party, the Liberal Party, had announced that and would effect that." Lo and behold, these people feel that to honour their commitment is to reverse it. They did not eliminate tuition fees. What they have done is that they have increased tuition fees.

What faith, I ask, what trust should people have in a government that says one thing at one stage, quite likely to get the young votes, and then when it has them under its hands, gives the highest increase ever in tuition fees or ever in taxes, for the people who are most vulnerable in this recession, those who are unable to work and those who have to go to school and pay a very enormous tuition fee?

I know people will hurry to tell me that this is one of the lowest-tuition-fee-paying provinces or country in the western world, but that's not the point.

**Hon Richard Allen (Minister without Portfolio in Economic Development and Trade):** What point is there?

**Mr Curling:** The point is that you are now asked to pay more in a recessionary year. Sure, I think tuition fees could be increased. But to increase it this enormously at a time when the ability to get an income is more difficult, I can't understand. I know the former Minister of Colleges and Universities must be saying to himself, "My golly, I would not have instituted something like that." Of course there is more to be paid towards tuition, but 20% is an enormous amount, to the former minister.

**Hon Mr Allen:** How is it that more students are going to universities than ever before?

**Mr Curling:** The former minister says, how is that more students will go to university? It has not increased any space at all in the university. It hasn't done so. We have not expanded in any way.

The fact is that many of those students, if you look even in the community colleges, are hurting people. They're hurting people who have now finished their degree in university, they can't find a job, and would now either go on to do another degree, waiting for a job or waiting for the times to improve, and then move on to do something else, like in the community colleges. Those people who are coming through the high school system are now competing to do their post-secondary education with university grad students, because there are no jobs out there.

Furthermore, to get further education is more expensive: a 20% increase. It is just disgraceful, and it's an insult to the promises you have made and committed yourself to.

The hurting people: the minorities in our community. When the former speaker, Mr Runciman, spoke as he did, it pains me. He talked about my colleague from Renfrew and about issues he has raised. I'm sure what my colleague from Renfrew is saying is that in a Parliament like this, the Legislature, we must raise all the issues and debate them fully.

What has happened now, I have noticed, very much so, is that the right-wing groups are aligning themselves with all those I would almost call rednecks. The party in Ottawa, the Reformers, have said they would like to be recognized as the redneck party, which I thought was disgusting, that they would like to be called that.

The paper reports that the leader of the Conservative Party, speaking the other day out in the rural areas, said, "They call me Attila the Un, because I'm gonna unlegislate and I'm gonna unregulate and I'm gonna unhire and I'm gonna untax." The article continued, "He told the mainly white audience in Bobcaygeon that many people born in Canada, to whom he referred as 'your own people,' are gravitating to welfare. He attributed this to government encouragement."

Mr Speaker, I am concerned. I said to you in my opening comments that this province of Ontario is an inclusive province of all people. Gone are the days that we could define Ontario, say 30, 40, 50 years ago, as predominantly anything. Now we have a variety of people of all colours, of all classes, of all religions, and what we have to do is be more inclusive.

1610

We cannot start preaching. This sort of situation I think is almost inciting some sort of unrest in our province. It's unfortunate, but the beautiful thing about democracy is that those issues will be spoken to very well in the next, upcoming election, which I hope this government will call very soon. They're hurting people.

The welfare recipients: I remember that my leader raised the issue about welfare fraud in this House, that we have to look to refine the system. There was a report out there that was maligning some people in some respects, and she raised the issue to say: "Is this true? Are you going to use this report? Is this a legitimate report about the Somalians?"

By golly, the government of the day, the NDP, jumped up and accused my leader of saying that Somalians are abusing the welfare system, when I can tell you she raised that issue because she knows very well that sometimes reports by bureaucrats are acted upon without any justification, and she wanted to bring it out into the light. The NDP government jumped on that and said that it is our leader who is maligning the Somalians.

I want to tell you, that kind of politics will not work. Of course, the Conservative Party came on side because it thinks it's political to get some votes on this. Gone are the days when that will happen.

I know my colleagues want to speak and I don't want to speak too long on this, but I want to talk about one other issue that concerns me within my riding and it's spreading: Zero tolerance, they call it in the schools.

I would say to the government here and the municipal governments: Stop blaming the victims. If we see young people—and of course we must have respect for property and life. Of course we must do something about that. But let's get to the core of the problem. What is causing this?

Don't build larger jails. Don't go about giving harsher punishment and think this will correct the situation. They are people who are desperate. They're frustrated. They

realize that their futures are taken away. Realize yourself that as you increase tuition fees and make it more difficult for them and their parents, who are losing their jobs and losing their homes, they are frustrated. But to say, as soon as we see frustration in the schools, "Zero tolerance," and "Don't bring them here," it's either "You pay me now or pay me later" that's going to happen. To suspend someone for life from education is a gross neglect of one's responsibility in dealing with the real issue.

I urge my colleagues here and in other jurisdictions of government to look at this very seriously and make sure that we don't abandon our young people, to say they are suspended or expelled for life because of an irresponsible act, and maybe some of those irresponsible acts are fatal.

As I said, as we look to spend our money and we ask for approval for this interim supply, there are people who are hurting out there. While you're trying to pay the civil servants and pay everybody else, make sure that you can have a payday for all those people who are suffering.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I'm pleased to speak in this interim supply debate because we were only given two days to debate the budget. The largest tax grabs in provincial history in this country were contained in the last budget, yet notwithstanding that, this government that said it was dedicated to open government when it came into office gave the opposition parties, the parties that express the views of the 62.2% of the electorate that didn't vote for the governing party in the last election—62.2% of the people did not vote for the NDP, and that's fine—were given two days of debate for the largest tax grab in history.

Just to recite for the government, historically we have had approximately 10 days of debate on the budget, consistently, with five or six contiguous days of debate. Notwithstanding this, we were given only two days of debate, and since last year's budget, just a little bit over a year ago, we have totally had two days of debate. What we're doing is we're getting yipping from the government over the fact that I'm pointing out that this government is extinguishing the rights of the opposition to express, in this case, the views of the majority. This is the first point.

We've had three downgrades in the provincial standings so far as our credit is concerned since this government came to power. In three and a half years we've had three downgrades, and I wouldn't be at all surprised if we saw another downgrade.

Borrowing is not the answer, and this has been part of this government's problem. They've jacked up taxes, but they've also increased borrowing tremendously. Notwithstanding that, they haven't come to the final conclusion that it's irresponsible, that it isn't fair to our children and our children's children to build up this level of debt.

We borrowed last year \$1 billion a month on international markets to service our debt. Let's put \$1 billion a month in perspective. That is \$100 per man, woman and child in this province per month to service the debt. I can't think of a more stinging indictment of a government that would attract that kind of burden on the electorate. The average family, we know, is 3.1 people. That means that for the average family in this province, there was \$310 per month borrowed, each and every month last

year, to service the debt.

We are now the fourth-largest borrower on international money markets in the world. The only people who are ahead of us on the international capital markets are the World Bank, the Kingdom of Sweden and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. You may recall that this is the bank which was headed up by that other profligate socialist intellectual, Mr Attali, who has since departed, kicked out essentially. He spent money on all of the wrong things. He built a big palace for himself. Does that sound familiar? Do you recall the story of the Workers' Compensation Board that is building a brand-new building for itself at enormous expense in downtown Toronto when we have a record vacancy rate in downtown office space?

What else did this government do? They've moved \$804 million off book into the newly created capital corporations. They've also taken \$600 million that normally they would have given to school boards, and they've said, "Ah, school boards, you've got more borrowing capacity than we have, so you borrow the money now and we'll give you the money to debt-service." You know something? The international bond rating agencies aren't buying it and that's why, I suspect, we will have another downgrade of the credit of this government.

Do you know the Provincial Auditor didn't buy it either? He publicly stated that he disapproved of the actions of this government and he refused to sign the books of this government. For the first time in history, a Provincial Auditor refused to sign the books.

1620

More taxation is not the answer. Since the last Conservative government in this province, we've had 33 Liberal tax grabs and 32 to date from the NDP. Where are we now? Well, we have the second-highest marginal tax rate in Canada, at 52.4%. For every person who aspires to something, to work hard and to save for their retirement, because undoubtedly governments are not going to be able to look after the majority of the population of this province and in fact this country, because of their profligate ways, those people are being penalized with a 52.4% marginal tax rate.

This is having the effect that Ontario has become a very unattractive place to do business. It has been suggested that Ontario is a wonderful place to live, but it's a lousy place to do business. Unless we very quickly make it a good place to do business, it's also going to become a lousy place to live.

We now have \$70 billion worth of debt that this government has racked up. In fairness, they didn't rack it all up; they've only doubled it in three and half years. It takes a little bit of believing that any government can double the debt in such a short time, but these are bad times and nobody would deny it. But this government has consistently refused to come to terms with the fundamental problems. They have been the arbiters of their own fate to a great extent. They have chased businesses away from Ontario.

How do we come to that conclusion? If you look at how other provinces in Canada have been doing during



this recession, you will come to the conclusion that on the whole Ontario has fared the worst. We have a Fair Tax Commission report, which came out in the middle of December, that cost the taxpayers of this province \$8.6 million and yet we have seen no action yet from this government.

As the Treasurer prepares his 1994 budget, I would suggest that not only should he make the commitment to no new taxes; we need tax decreases. Not only do we need tax decreases; we must hold the line on fees and perhaps eliminate some fees. A good example would be the ridiculous fee of \$50 per year per company for registration.

What service is anybody getting for that \$50? None whatsoever. The original grab a couple of years ago by this government was under the guise that it was a one-time tax and that it was just so they could update their books. Do you know what? The Treasurer got to rather like that money, so the next year he had amnesia; he forgot that he'd said the year before that it was one-time tax. Now it has become a permanent tax.

Let's just look at some of the tax grabs and fee grabs that we saw last year. We saw property assessment appeals. Anybody wanting to appeal the taxes they're paying—I'm not saying for just some flight of fantasy; they believe they're paying too much tax and they launch an appeal. A residential owner now pays \$20 to launch that appeal and a commercial tenant pays \$70.

We've seen this government put tax on insurance premiums. The effect has been that insurance has become more expensive for all the citizens of this province. I can believe a lot of things about this government, but that it would tax the poorest people in the province with a tax on their insurance that they need to be able to operate their automobile is almost unbelievable. But never the less, they did this.

They took away the commercial concentration tax, but surprise, they replaced it with a tax on parking fees. In other words, while the Titanic is sinking, they're rearranging the deck chairs. We have a tax on clay, on gravel and on unfinished stone. This same government last year eliminated the retail sales tax rebate program. The provincial share of personal income taxes went from 14% to 20%. That is a very significant tax increase, by any yardstick whatsoever. On top of that, surtaxes were increased from 6% to 10%. They also introduced a 2% corporate minimum tax. More of that later on corporate minimum tax.

We also saw them bring in photo-radar, which is quite clearly an undisguised grab of funds.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** It is intended to catch people who are breaking the law.

**Mr Turnbull:** We've had a tax regime from this government, and in fact the previous Liberal government, which has made Ontario unattractive.

**Mr Perruzza:** Are speeding tickets now a tax grab or are they intended to catch people who break the law?

**Mr Turnbull:** Mr Speaker, perhaps this man would like to get on the speaking roster.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Order,

please. Interjections are out of order. Would the honourable member please address the chair.

**Mr Perruzza:** You know about law and order, David. Law and order is if you have a law, you have to enforce it.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Downsview is out of order.

**Mr Turnbull:** Last year our leader, Mike Harris, set up a task force to investigate opportunity for small and medium-sized businesses. It was titled Task Force on Cutting Red Tape and Growing Small Business. We had hearings right across this province and we met with every possible type of group. We met with small business people, we met with private individuals, we met with industry groups and we spoke to them.

There was a great similarity in all of the presentations that they made to us. Consistently they said that Ontario had an anti-business climate and they talked about the fact that it wasn't just one tax which was the burden; it was a culmination of all the taxes I've already related to you which has made Ontario uncompetitive.

It is indeed alarming when small business people who live in my riding come to me and say, "David, I'm thinking of leaving." They're not all going to the US, as the NDP would have you believe, because of free trade. They're going to other provinces because they find a friendlier climate. But yes, indeed, many are going to the US, because they believe there is fundamentally a more friendly climate which is welcoming of entrepreneurial spirit.

One of the difficulties small businesses have is the lack of funding available to them, and the financial institutions of this country certainly have to bear a very large part of the burden and the guilt for that. One of the reasons those financial institutions are able to withhold funds to small and medium businesses is because government is crowding out the funds. They are competing with small businesses by mopping up funds which are otherwise available to invest in small businesses.

Banks have to invest their funds, because they have to make their span, otherwise they're not in business, but governments that are borrowing at the rate of noughts that this government is borrowing are competing with businesses. We are seeing small businesses that are closing because they cannot get renewal of funding. They're just closing down, and these are jobs that are lost.

But what does this government do for large businesses? If they're unionized businesses, they will bail them out no matter what the cost of those jobs. We have seen this with Algoma, de Havilland and several other examples, because this government believes it must pay back the people who've supported it over the years.

Let's just take a look at what this government does. I read from that infamous document, the NDP's Agenda for People. At the bottom of the first page it said, "Whether it's the 40,000 profitable corporations that pay no income tax, the developers who donate thousands of dollars to Liberals while making millions in real estate deals, corporate polluters fouling our environment while going

unpunished...." It goes on in this vein.

The corporations that are not paying their fair share of taxes—and remember that rallying cry. I'm sure, Mr Bradley, you remember the rallying cry "corporate welfare bums." You will be, I'm sure, most surprised about the announcement that I read in the London Free Press about this government, the NDP socialist government of this province, forgiving a loan of \$7.65 million to Chrysler of Canada.

1630

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** To the company?

**Mr Turnbull:** Yes, the company. But it didn't just forgive it in a year of bad times; it forgave it in a year of its all-time record revenues. What were they doing with the money, that corporation, that year? Well, I'll tell you. Many people in the company, in fact all people, were enjoying a large bonus. Some of them were enjoying a bonus of as much as 100% of their regular income.

So Mr Rae trots down to Windsor and says: "Don't worry, I don't think you're a corporate welfare bum. I think it's a great idea that you give a bonus of 100% to your management and a lesser percentage to the workers, but indeed still a large percentage. Let's forgive you this loan of \$7.65 million." What a very interesting way of looking after the public purse. Now, do you remember that saying, "corporate welfare bums"? That's this government.

I would like to offer some constructive solutions as to what this government should do. I think if they were to take this advice they wouldn't go far wrong.

First of all, I believe very strongly that we need an independent controller general who will be independent and appointed on consultation equally between all three party leaders. This person must be totally neutral and prepared to do the equivalent job of the Auditor General.

The Auditor General, unfortunately, can only look back at expenditures and say, "You did it wrong." A controller general, if we gave him great autonomy, would be able to examine all proposed bills and say, "This is the likely cost of implementing this." They would be able to pass information to the government and to the opposition parties as to what the impact would be and call for independent impact studies, financial impact studies, of the results of what legislation of any party that was in power at the time would do. As a tool to support the independent controller general, we need a good econometric model of the Ontario economy. He would be able to review cost, effectiveness and value of programs.

Does this sound like a partisan view, to suggest that we have an independent controller general appointed by all three leaders who would survive governments and comment on the validity of legislation?

I believe that we need to have balanced-budget legislation so that future governments—because I'm positive it wouldn't be passed during this government's term. We need to have balanced-budget requirements so that governments would be required to live within their means so that young people, such as our pages who are here today, will not be paying for our sins. They can pay for

their own sins, but let them decide what they are.

We have to control spending by cutting out the abuse of the health care system, which is estimated by some internal sources from the Ministry of Health as being as much as \$600 million a year. Welfare has been estimated to involve \$500 million to \$700 million a year worth of fraud. And non-profit housing, which is benefiting people who are supposed to be paying so-called market rent but in fact are paying significantly less than market rent and are paying way less than the economic rent—that program, according to the government's own numbers, is going to cost \$1.5 billion a year by next year. So there is over \$2-billion worth of savings right there.

If we reward efficiency in government and eliminate year-end burnoff of budgets, we would then be a long way along the road to fiscal responsibility, because the bureaucrats would get a bonus according to how much money they could save, not how much money they can spend at the end of the year. Reward efficiency, reward good employees and clean up government.

Please, for the sake of the young pages, all the children of the members in this House, all the children of the people who are watching this program, all the people of the province, it's a reasonable challenge which we should rise to if we are to do our job as legislators.

#### ROYAL ASSENT

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Before we proceed to further debate, I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in his office.

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex McFedries):** The following are the titles of the bills to which His Honour has assented:

Bill Pr63, An Act respecting the Township of Glanbrook

Bill Pr78, An Act respecting the Township of Huron and the Village of Ripley

Bill Pr89, An Act respecting the Town of Bothwell

Bill Pr91, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

#### INTERIM SUPPLY

(continued)

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I wasn't going to refer to this in the context of an interim supply debate, but in view of the fact that the member for Leeds-Grenville earlier on this afternoon raised this matter in what I thought was an outrageous fashion and a very disappointing one for me, I do have to put a few points on the record, points that will take some time away from the short time that already is allocated to me, because I think it's a very important issue that he raised.

I do agree with the member for Leeds-Grenville that yes, the public has a right and should be informed on all the issues that are before the House, absolutely. There's nothing wrong with it and that's the way it should happen.

However, the way the member for Leeds-Grenville obviously supported the approach of his party in the by-election to me recalls the worst days, frankly, of the



Conservative Party. It harks back to some of the days when they tried to play with issues, bringing up fears in people in my own riding of Carleton when I was the candidate in 1981 in a by-election, where the Conservatives, then under Premier Davis, were going around and saying these terrible Liberals were going to make the province officially bilingual. It worked, and obviously the scare tactic in the Victoria-Haliburton by-election worked as well.

I'm on public record on how I feel about same-sex benefits. I have voted against Bill 45. However, very clearly, if the Conservative Party is against that, it should say so. I feel, very contrary to what the member for Leeds-Grenville said, that the ad campaign that was done in that by-election—and there are certain words we cannot use in this House because they would be unparliamentary. But I really feel it was most underhanded, it was sneaky to allege, as was done in bold letters—and I saw the ads, obviously done not by the candidate, clearly, because they were too sophisticated, but by the central party, by the Harris party—the way they were alleging that same-sex family benefits were the top priority for the NDP and for the Liberals, as opposed to jobs.

I think that was deliberate skulduggery and I take offence at that, and I take offence at the member for Leeds-Grenville accusing my deputy leader of falsely criticizing the Conservative Party for their tactic, because I think it was the wrong tactic.

If they're against it, if the Conservatives are against it, let them come out, let them say that. If they would have placed an ad that said the Conservative Party or Mike Harris or whoever, Hodgson, the candidate is against this, fine. He has every right to do so, and I intend to do that. But don't say that this is the top priority for either the NDP or the Liberal Party. That's what they did and that's what I take offence at, and I think the member for Leeds-Grenville is dead wrong if he says that they had a right to do that.

They had no right to do that because anybody who has observed the debate in this House for the last two years knows that the concerns, certainly, of the Liberal Party, and I give credit to the NDP as well, with jobs are way higher on the order of priority than the same-sex issue. I do say, yes, there are concerns and there are different views and I know there are different views even in the Conservative Party on that matter. These people have a right to express those, but do it in a way that's upfront, that's honest, that's clear and don't try and fool the people.

1640

So, as I say, it's unfortunate that I have to say this but since the member for Leeds-Grenville earlier on this afternoon raised the issue, I think I ought to set the record straight and put my views on the record.

With regard to the interim supply that is before us and that really we should be addressing, there's one issue that again the Conservatives—and I understand that—and the NDP increasingly are pulling out of their old drawer of goodies. They accuse the Liberals, and the Peterson government in particular, of having fudged their figures on the deficit in the campaign in 1990, and I remember

it well. They said it was going to be a balanced budget and then the deficit turned out to be \$3 billion.

Again, to the credit of the NDP, to the credit of the Treasurer, he did not blame the Peterson government for—

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** He didn't.

**Mr Daigeler:** "He didn't," and I will quote to the member, who is over there and I think who is not in his seat, what the Treasurer said, and this is an article from the Toronto Star, October 11, 1990. Here's what Treasurer Floyd Laughren said about the deficit: "Today, the Treasurer said the deficit will be far higher, but Laughren blamed the failing economy more than the former government." Now I'm quoting, "I'm not saying"—this is Floyd Laughren speaking—"the Liberals lied to you or anybody else lied to you," he said. "I'm just telling you the economy deteriorated rapidly in the second quarter and these are the results."

Very clearly, as I said, to the credit of the Treasurer, that's what he used to say, and I think that was fair and I really appreciated that. However now, since we're coming to the next election very soon and very quickly, both the Premier and the Treasurer now keep saying: "Well, it was all the fault of the Liberals. They left a big deficit for us, and us poor guys, how could we cope with this?"

The reality is that the Treasurer himself, with his own words, recognized after the election that he did not inherit a big deficit from the Liberals but that it was the economic situation which very quickly started to deteriorate.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** The Provincial Auditor said that.

**Mr Daigeler:** Yes, as my friend the member for Mississauga North just said, the Provincial Auditor very clearly confirmed that.

By the way, let's keep things in relationship. We were talking in 1990 of a deficit of \$3 billion. Now it's well into \$10 billion. So in those days it was \$3 billion. How did that come about? The Provincial Auditor said because the revenues were dropping very significantly and very quickly, and secondly, and let's not forget that, because of certain deliberate spending decisions by the NDP government.

Again, that was their right. They were elected to do that. They said, "Okay, we want to spend that money." I can just hear the Conservative Party in the election that's coming up, tramping around out there saying: "Oh, these terrible Liberals. They left us this big deficit and now we can't manage it." The reality is that there were very clear spending decisions by this current government which have led increasingly to a rising deficit. But just for the record, I want to repeat that. I've said it before, but this certainly warrants being said again and again.

What also warrants being said again and again—frankly, I'm quite proud myself of having said it so early on. A few weeks ago the Treasurer said how terrible it was that the federal Liberal government was reducing the tobacco tax and that it was going to cost him at least \$500 million. He said that was a very significant sum for the treasury and it was just terrible that he was losing that

amount of \$500 million. Guess what? The figure of \$500 million rings a very distinct bell in my head, I can tell you, because, guess what? Bill 1 of the government over there, of the NDP government, deliberately gave up \$500 million every year, and that was starting in 1990. Probably by now it would be much higher.

What was that Bill 1? It was the tax on tax. As I said then, and I said that on the record on December 5, 1990, right here in the House. I said it sounded very generous and sounded great that we weren't putting the provincial sales tax at the bottom of the line. That was an existing tax. It wasn't one that had to be instituted; it was one that they took away. They deliberately, freely, of their own will, gave up \$500 million.

Now the Treasurer is going around and says how terrible it is that he's losing \$500 million on the tobacco sales tax. If he hadn't been so generous in 1990, he would have still that \$500 million, and probably a lot more, because the provincial sales tax probably would have, by now, brought in quite a bit more.

I said at the time, on December 5, 1990: "If anybody thinks they won't have to pay for that \$500 million the Treasurer deliberately and freely is giving up right now, they are sadly mistaken. This decision will surely come back and haunt this government." It has come back and is haunting this government with a vengeance.

I didn't look at the clock, and several of my colleagues want to speak still, so I have to be a bit quick with my remarks, but I can't fail to mention the students, because I saw the former Minister of Colleges and Universities here. Frankly, I hope, because unfortunately we haven't seen or heard anything from the member for Hamilton West, who was the former Minister of Colleges and Universities for about a year—it's unfortunate, because I think he had things to contribute. I hope he left the cabinet because he just couldn't stomach any more the way the Premier and the way his cabinet colleagues were trampling on the students. If there's any group this government over there has had it in for, it's the students. I really did not expect that. I did not expect this government to have it in for the students.

What have they done? Every year they've raised tuition by almost 10%. They've taken away the grants totally so now you can access only loans. Every decision they make has been going against the students of this province. If there's any party I would have expected that from, it's the Tory Party, but I certainly didn't expect that from the NDP. I find that very, very unpleasant to see.

I remember, because I was the critic for Colleges and Universities shortly after the election, that the students were there and were throwing macaroni at me. It was the member for Brantford, Mr Ward, who then was representing, as parliamentary assistant, the Minister of Colleges and Universities. He promised in his grandiose way, "The Liberals fumbled the ball, but we, the NDP, we're going to carry the ball, and we're going to win and we're going to score." Well, guess what? They more than fumbled the ball. If there's any group, as I said, that has been really hit hard by this government, it's the students, and I find that very unfortunate. This is something I fundamentally disagree with.

1650

In conclusion, this government has had problems in managing the economy because of faulty decisions right at the very beginning of its mandate, disastrous decisions. We warned them at the time very clearly. In 1990, in 1991, all the other provincial governments were already cutting back, were already putting limits on salary increases. What was the NDP government still doing at the time? It sounded great, and certainly the people thought: "Gee, this is great. We're all getting 6% and 7% more, all across the civil service." They gave the nurses a big increase. Everybody got greater returns from the provincial government.

Guess what? Now this government has to take it all back. They realize they were the wrong decisions at the wrong time. That is the message which is so important at this time, that the fiscal management of the NDP government really shows an abysmal lack of knowhow, an abysmal lack of the basic principles of economic affairs. I think that's why we need a new government, and we need a Liberal government.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I would like to make a few comments with respect to the debate on the motion for interim supply. One of the most-asked questions of me and perhaps other members of this House is: "When can we get rid of the NDP government? Do we have to wait until September 1995?"

I found it interesting that this topic seemed to surface this week. The Premier of the province made some comments that maybe we would, maybe we wouldn't, and the theories were going out that we would wait until after the Quebec election and that then Mr Rae and the NDP would save the country. They would save the country.

Having said that, we then look to what the NDP government and Mr Rae have done to the province of Ontario. There's no question, to be fair to them, that they happened to be elected during a recession, at the beginning of a recession, or partway through. I do acknowledge that, but on the other hand we have to start examining some of your policies you have put forward and question whether that has scared away jobs, whether it has scared away investments. That, of course, is the theory that is being put forward. I see the Minister of Labour is here, and there's no question that he and his ministry are being accused, particularly with some of the labour laws that have been put forward.

By the fall, this province will have one of the world's worst debts, more than \$80 billion. That's about \$16,000 in additional debt for every family of four in Ontario to repay to Wall Street and other investors outside this province. Rae's red ink made David Peterson's spending mess much worse.

Carrying on with the comments made by the former speaker, there is no question that Mr Laughren made some comments with respect to the way the Liberals left this province, but we do have to look where we've gone from 1990 to now. Even taking into consideration the recession, compare the development of this province to other provinces, to other North American jurisdictions, and your track record is not that good.



One of the areas you have tried to deal with, to try to cut back, particularly on government expenditures, is Bill 48, which gave a whole new meaning to collective bargaining. Now we're on the eve of a new budget, which presumably will come in some time next month, and taxpayers still don't know if the original restraint package that was put forward in Bill 48 has worked. I believe there was one page of unsubstantiated figures offered in the pre-budget hearings. That's all there is. We have no idea whether Bill 48, the social contract, has worked, to determine its effectiveness.

Our leader called for an audit of the social contract. He asked five questions. That's the least this government can do, to see if this piece of legislation, is working, because it's got the people who work in this place very upset.

(1) What internal government provisions are in place to evaluate the social contract's effectiveness?

(2) What criteria will be used in this process? How and when will the results be reported to the public?

(3) What projections exist on the impact of renewed public sector wage demands following the expiry of the social contract in 1995—the so-called “wage bubble” effect?

Can you imagine what's going to happen when this social contract expires? It's going to be absolute madness. Whether the Liberals are in power or the Conservatives are in power, because it certainly isn't going to be the NDP, it's going to be just awful. It's incumbent upon this government to look into these matters now and not wait for a Liberal government or a Conservative government to deal with these issues.

(4) What will be the impact when the essential service workers are compensated for their Rae days, as specified in the legislation?

(5) Has the government tracked compensation costs for replacement workers filling in for Rae day absences?

We're concerned with all of these figures. We're concerned with recent disclosures that suggest that the package, Bill 48, may have increased the cost of government. Mr Upshaw, the head of OPSEU, said that the Rae day rollback granted his union earlier this month cost the province over \$30 million. The Ontario Nurses' Association, Metro Toronto Community Services, the Guelph Correctional Centre and the Whitby Jail have said that replacement worker costs for Rae days are increasing payroll. In other words, you have one group of people who are taking Rae days off and another group of people who are working on those same days claiming overtime, so it's costing the government more. Unions, firefighters, OPSEU and correctional institutions are all saying Bill 48 is costing the province money. Even the very people taking Rae days, those very people, are saying those things.

All the questions our leader, Mike Harris, has put forward need to be dealt with now and not just left to float with one page, period, of unsubstantiated facts drifting around this province.

I would like to read a letter which came from my riding, from Caledon Meals on Wheels, which I suspect is typical of many institutions around this province that are concerned with the social contract. It was a series of

two letters, and I'll try to refer to both of them at the same time. One was written to me and one was written to the program supervisor of long-term care. They're concerned about the very existence, the continuation of Caledon Meals on Wheels, because of the social contract.

“When the NDP government introduced the social contract, it emphasized that this policy would not disrupt or downgrade any services to the elderly, ill, or disabled. Since its introduction, many of us have had to struggle with the realities of this ill-devised policy. We at Caledon Meals on Wheels have been adversely affected. Because of the social contract, we were cut off from our reliable and high-standard food supply source for 12 days in 1993. In 1994 it is projected we will lose 24 days, or approximately 960 meals.

“We therefore had a choice: tell our recipients we could not serve them for those days, or find an alternate food source if possible. Not much of a choice really, because if we cut back on our deliveries it would have led to confusion among our recipients as service would have become irregular.

1700

“We did find another source at considerable distance from our office, and we had to deliver the empty bags one day, pick up the meals the next day, and constantly deal with the problem of keeping the meals warm, as they still had to be delivered over a large geographical area. In addition to this, it was difficult to accurately predict the exact time when the meals would be ready for delivery, therefore causing inconvenience to our volunteer drivers, as well as the recipients.

“The whole scenario has caused the Caledon Meals on Wheels staff, and volunteers, much frustration, loss of time, and of course an increase in operating expenses.

“Without the faithful volunteers, Caledon Meals on Wheels simply would not be able to operate, and their time, calculated at minimum wage, is worth approximately \$60,000 a year. So if they get frustrated and quit, are you going to mail us a cheque for \$60,000, Mr Rae, or do we simply say to our recipients, ‘Sorry, but Mr Rae has put us out of business.’”

A very startling letter, and that's typical of a number of letters. I'm not going to read them all, but it's typical of a number of letters where people in my riding have expressed a concern with respect to the effects of the social contract, which clearly was not well-thought-out legislation.

I would like to read one more letter, from the Peel Children's Centre, which was copied to me but was sent to the Minister of Community and Social Services. That letter expresses similar concerns. I believe it went to all the MPPs in our riding, one of whom is in the House today. I'm sure he has received this letter as well. It expresses the concern on the operation of these organizations and functions that are trying to provide services in our various constituencies.

“I am writing you today on behalf of the board of directors of Peel Children's Centre. We have recently become aware of your ministry's plan to reduce our fiscal 1994-95 budget by 2%, this reduction being termed the

expenditure control plan. The reason for writing is to implore you to reconsider and reverse this decision.

"As I know you are aware, the funding to the Peel community for children's mental health services is the lowest per capita in the entire province of Ontario.... We are also encouraged by your continued support through the Child and Family Services Act policy framework to continue efforts towards the development of an equitable funding formula for the province in the Child and Family Services Act area of service delivery. We must however ask for a concrete demonstration of this support in regards to the implementation of the proposed expenditure control plan."

All these organizations are really having a great deal of difficulty keeping their heads above water. They're holding on by their fingertips. Meanwhile, the Treasurer continues on in announcing that he's going to have a budget next month, and the Premier is talking about jobs, jobs, jobs. Yet I can tell you, I don't know what's going on in your constituencies, but in my constituency people are barely surviving. I'm talking about the volunteer groups that are trying to assist the public.

One other letter on this subject, which has a similar effect, was written from the Dufferin County Medical Society. It was a letter addressed to myself. It expresses the frustrations of people who are attempting to receive medical services in our area and the disruption in medical assistance. I'm pleased the Minister of Health is here in the House to hear this letter.

"You may have noticed announcements in the local newspapers concerning service reductions by physicians in Orangeville and Shelburne. Further announcements concerning service reductions during the month of March should appear soon. Members of the Dufferin County Medical Society are arranging to not work for approximately five days during the month of March. To avoid disruption these days are not being taken simultaneously or individually as a block.

"On August 1, 1993, Ontario doctors signed an agreement with government designed to meet expenditure reduction targets for medical services under the social contract. Under the agreement, funding for health care services has been substantially reduced. Based on available OHIP statistics on use of medical services, the amount of expenditure reduction from the health care budget for physician services for fiscal year 1993-94 could be as high as \$150 million.

"During the last six months, Ontario doctors have fulfilled our obligations under the social contract, while continuing to provide quality care to our patients. Since October 1, 1993, physicians have been subjected to a 4.8% holdback on payments for all OHIP services rendered. This measure only partially meets our social contract obligations. Therefore, the Ontario Medical Association proposed to government a plan that included mandatory social contract days for physicians. However, government refused to support this proposal, leaving doctors to find other ways to meet the government's reduction targets.

"For this reason, doctors are organizing planned social contract days on our own." The purpose of this letter is

to show the lack of cooperation between the Ministry of Health and the doctors. "In our opinion, this is the fairest and least disruptive way"—

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** Give me a break.

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** Come on now.

**Mr Tilson:** Well, that's what they're saying. I can't believe you didn't get similar letters from doctors in your riding.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. Interjections are out of order.

**Mr Tilson:** Well, you probably haven't read your letters.

"In our opinion, this is the fairest and least disruptive way of meeting government's expenditure reduction target, while maintaining the availability of necessary medical services.

"Our patients will receive sufficient advance notice of these closures, and will be informed that while our ability to handle routine visits will be somewhat reduced, emergency services throughout the area will be maintained at all times."

So the medical people are trying to make the best of a bad thing; there's no question. But the emphasis I am giving to you is that there certainly hasn't been the greatest amount of support to the medical people in this province.

I would like to comment briefly with respect to the infrastructure in transfer payments. Speakers before me have spent considerable time on this topic. There's one small issue, and I'm talking about the arrangement with the federal government and the provincial government to share in infrastructure expenditures.

A notice came out from the federal government indicating specifically that in my riding there was an estimated total project cost for Peel for a voice radio system of police—this was throughout the region of Peel and this cost \$5.4 million. In the town of Shelburne, there was a water supply pumphouse and watermain, and this cost \$490,000.

The point I'm trying to make on this is—and I'm sure these municipalities are pleased to get these things—that they're being asked to do these things, no matter what. They really don't have any choice as to their ability. Many of their reserve funds, their special levies have been spent, so in fact the action of this government is going to force municipalities into debt that they have never seen before, and I have grave concern about that. We talk about the debt of this province and now we're going to start talking about the debt of municipalities.

The Treasurer indicated that the status quo would remain the same on transfer payments to municipalities, hospitals and school boards, but if a municipality wants to take advantage of the infrastructure program it must come up with its one-third share. Meanwhile, all water and sewer improvements, to which infrastructure applies, are covered by Bill 17 under the Ontario Clean Water



Agency. This now means—and this has been emphasized by several speakers in the House—that these things are all going to be loans, that they're going to have to pay it back. The government says, "Oh, yes, we'll undertake to pay it back," but I quite frankly have to question that.

In the past, these things were called grants; now they're called loans. Whether you're talking hospitals or whether you're talking school boards or whether you're talking municipalities, moneys that formerly were grants are now loans and have to be paid back. We'll have to keep our fingers crossed that the province of Ontario will honour its commitment to assist the municipalities in paying those loans back to these new corporations.

There are several other issues that I would like to spend some time on. One is the credit rating. The member for Scarborough-Agincourt gave an excellent speech yesterday, I believe, on the fear of where we're going with respect to the credit rating.

1710

I believe there's no question that foreign investors are simply scared as to where we're going. They hold about 43% of our combined provincial-federal \$600-billion debt. That's sending our dollar to near-record lows, and as a result interest rates are going up. We're seeing that today. I haven't looked at the financial pages for today, but certainly when you look at this week that's exactly what's happening. The predictions are coming true because of the economic policies of the government.

There's rumour that the bond rating agencies are preparing a new bad report on the province of Ontario. That troubles me. Mr Laughren, the Finance Minister or Treasurer, says he'd pass off a \$2.1-billion revenue shortfall under next year's deficit, and that seems to be what's happening. He's passing off these deficits, these debts, into the years ahead. The prime example is the five-year licence. He's claiming the income now but it's actually for the next five years.

#### *Interjection.*

**Mr Tilson:** That's exactly what he's doing. The rumour is that that agency will downgrade the bond rating to a single A. Since the NDP came to power we should look at where our credit rating has gone. You can't blame all of this on the recession. You have to take credit for the terrible laws that you've been putting forward, whether taxes, whether labour or whether just generally anti-business. You have to acknowledge that. Because since the NDP came to power in Ontario, our credit rating has been downgraded from AAA to AA+ and now AA-. This means that it will cost taxpayers more to carry a debt load that has soared to somewhere close to \$80 billion, and that is just awful.

There's another speaker for our party who wishes to say a few words: the member for Oakville South. I will simply conclude by saying that I'm very troubled when it's suggested that the Premier is going to save Canada, because he sure hasn't saved the province. Ontario has become a have-not province as a result of their economic policies.

**Mr Offer:** Let me say that I am looking forward to taking part in this debate. Since the Legislature resumed

just a few days ago, this is the first time I've actually had the opportunity to partake of debate. I look forward to this, because I think the issue that we're talking about, the whole question of interim supply, is extremely important in so far as it relates to the way in which the Bob Rae NDP government has managed the affairs of the province of Ontario.

I can tell you that in my riding of Mississauga North the question that I am most often asked these days is: When is the next election? When are we going to be able to get these people out of office? It doesn't matter where one goes; I hear the same thing: "We want an election. We want to boot these guys out of office. They're an incompetent group of individuals and they have run the greatness of this province into the ground."

They were, I think, in a strange way quite pleased to hear that the Premier was really starting to focus on the next election. He was looking upon it as re-election, but I think there are a lot of people, certainly in my riding of Mississauga North and I believe throughout the province, who want their opportunity to tell Bob Rae and the NDP government, by their vote, the type of job they have done.

They are upset, they are furious, they just disagree with so many of the things that the Bob Rae NDP government has done. They see this as a government that is without direction. They see this as a government which continues to be unable to deal with the abysmally high rate of unemployment. Everyone knows that throughout every riding there are so many people out of work, many for the very first time in their lives, and they see no action, no direction, no commitment by the Bob Rae government to help those who have found themselves unemployed, to help combat and indeed fight that high unemployment rate.

They see the debt of this province soaring to unbelievable levels, levels which were only in their worst nightmares, that they are now the reality in this province. They see a government that has made mistake after mistake after mistake, and each one of its mistakes costs money and the dollars are piled upon the dollars and will remain the legacy not only of this government but the burden of all people.

When they see a Premier who wants to call an election, they say, "Fabulous." Finally, there is something they can agree with. They do not care how or on what issue Bob Rae calls the election. The people have something to say, and what they will say is, through their vote, "You, the NDP government, caused this debt to explode on the province of Ontario." The NDP government continues to pile dollars and the burden on the people of this province. There is a member from the NDP who of course will interject, who will say there really isn't any real debt.

**Ms Christel Haeck (St Catharines-Brock):** Dennis Timbrell says we are actually doing a good job.

**Mr Offer:** They talk about individuals who are saying they've done a good job. Well, if you've done such a great job, why don't you take your record, lay it out before the people of the province and let the people decide on your record?

I cannot wait to talk to the people certainly in my area on your record on the environment. I cannot wait to talk to the people in my riding on your record around small business and what you have done to them. I cannot wait to talk to the people about a variety of issues and what the real impact has been.

I might be the very first who will remind the NDP government of Bob Rae's famous pronouncement in the election of 1990, when as Leader of the Opposition he stood on the mount and said, "There will never, ever be a landfill created or an existing landfill expanded without a full environmental assessment hearing." Those were his words. That was his commitment to everyone in the province.

I just cannot wait to see what the reaction will be in my riding of Mississauga North, where the Britannia landfill site happens to be located, where that site was expanded by the then Minister of the Environment, Ruth Grier, with the consent, approval and encouragement of the now Premier of Ontario, Bob Rae. They allowed this landfill site to be expanded without any hearing whatsoever, and they dictated that the capacity of that landfill site is to be greater. When the community said, "But you made this promise," "We have the right to be part of a process where our concerns can be heard, the concerns of our community, of the business, of our families," the NDP Bob Rae government said, "No, no hearings." You will not be able to say anything," in direct contradiction to what Bob Rae, aspiring Premier of Ontario, said in the election of 1990.

1720

What about small business? I speak about my riding, and my riding, as you know, is a growing riding, growing residentially, commercially, industrially, many retail sectors, though we certainly have felt the impact of the recession. I have heard time and again about how this government has assaulted small business.

I have no doubt that there isn't a member on the government side who doesn't on occasion stand up and say that small business is the greatest creator of new jobs in this province. So how does this government repay the small business sector that it applauds in its speeches? How does the Bob Rae government say thank you to the small business sector? They do it by increasing the debt owed the province, which has an immediate and disastrous effect on small business, and they do it in what I believe is an insidious way: They put on each small business a \$50 corporate filing fee charge.

The first year, they say about this \$50 on businesses which are struggling to make it through the recession, on businesses whose bottom line has not yet bottomed out: "This \$50 fee is a one-time administration fee. We want to update our records." Businesses throughout my riding call me and write me and say: "How can they do this? How, in the depths of the recession, can the government gouge \$50 from each business?" The answer is that they don't care, that it's all right: "Get the money."

What happens after the first year of this one-time \$50 gouging-small-business fee? The government makes an announcement. Do they make the announcement in this Legislature? No. Is it a ministerial statement? No. Is it a

press conference? No. A tiny letter says that that one-time \$50 fee is now an annual fee. Each year, every company struggling to make a living, struggling to survive, struggling to exist, must pay the government \$50. Now, to me, \$50 during a recession, on companies that are hanging on, trying to at least maintain employment, is a lot of money. For a government to say, "We are going to add to your debt," is nothing less than an assault, an assault on the small business community. They assault the small business community through this \$50 fee, they assault the small business community on the WCB rates, they assault the small business community by continuing to pile debt upon debt upon debt, and after they do that, they look to the business community to try to get them out. Well, it just doesn't work.

The only consistency about this government is its lack of direction. They didn't have direction when they started, and let me tell you something, they're not going to have it until they end, and then they're going to be out, because the people are going to react and respond to the wonderful legacy of this government, the legacy of a \$50 tax on small business, the legacy of a historically high provincial debt, the legacy of—

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** The employer health tax.

**Ms Haack:** Yes, remember the employer health tax on small business?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The member for Mississauga North has the floor.

**Mr Offer:** The members of the government seem to get a touch testy when you try to remind them about their record, the record that five or 10 minutes ago they wanted to take to the people of the province. I want you to take your record to the people of the province. I want you to do what the Premier said. He wants to call an election. Call an election. I am confident.

I am only hopeful that in the next election, the NDP Bob Rae government will precisely outline exactly what it has done to the people of Ontario. The people of the province, I have every confidence, will respond, without any question.

**Mr George Dadamo (Windsor-Sandwich):** We know.

**Mr Offer:** Members on the government side say they know how they're going to respond. Maybe that is why they're a little reluctant to go forward for the next consultation.

There are other issues which clearly underscore how directionless this government has been, issues of some concern to me, such as its legislation around basement apartments, which I have been and continue to be very concerned about. There's the backdrop of a tragedy, many tragedies, and I know things are said, but I think it is absolutely clear that it doesn't matter what legislation a government introduces, it doesn't matter what regulations are attached to that legislation: If the government which introduces that legislation and regulations around basement apartments does not have with it the way these things are to be enforced, it will continue to cause difficulties and tragedies.



We have tried. We have pled with the Minister of Housing to listen to what is actually happening out in the community, that you have to have a way in which to enforce the rules. If you don't, you're going to cause, in many ways, more tragedy.

In conclusion, this is a government without direction. The people of this province are very clear about what they've stood for, what they stand for, what their record is. It is a government that has fiscally mismanaged this province and will lay upon the people of this province the burden of its incompetence.

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** I had planned to speak for about 20 minutes and offer the government some solutions, but as often happens around here, time is a little short. I'm down to about six minutes. Rather than speak very fast, I'll try to slow down and give you some of my points, and we'll stop when we run out of time.

I didn't want to spend a whole lot of time criticizing this government. What I wanted to do is put forward some of the solutions that I and our party have been working on over the last couple of years. When we first were elected in 1990, we made a conscious decision in our party that we were going to offer some constructive solutions to the government of the day.

When I look back, we started out with our Blueprint for Economic Renewal and Prosperity in Ontario, in which in its first year we told this government that you can't continue to tax, spend and borrow like there's no tomorrow.

I can still remember the day the Treasurer stood up here—the members all stood up and gave him a hand—and said, "We are going to fight the recession, not the deficit." I can still see his face as he stood up and said, "We are going to fight the recession." Had they taken our advice, and I don't say this to take too much credit, had this government listened to what we outlined in our 30 pages, this province would be better off today.

A couple of other areas we put forward, our second New Directions series, was a Blueprint for Learning in Ontario, the education system. I firmly believe the standard of living of the next generation will be in proportion to the skills and training we give our children today. We outlined 30 pages of the things we feel should be done.

Some of it, I must say, has been acted upon. Some of the issues of violence in schools we talked about almost two years ago are now being implemented, and we appreciate that the government is listening on some of the issues. Some of the other things like standard testing was put together, and this government is now taking a look at it, something it never believed in a few years ago.

Our third in the series was the Task Force on Crime, Justice and Community Safety in Ontario, where we talked about the issues of crime and community safety. We outlined some concerns we heard going across the province.

I want to tell you, as I've been out there over the last little while, I have never seen as much anger and hostility towards governments and, quite frankly, politicians at all levels and of all political stripes.

1730

I don't need to tell you that Ontario is in trouble. The way I see it, the problem very clearly is that we've been taxing, we've been spending, we've been overregulating, we've been overlegislating, we've been overgoverning, and as a result the businesses and the people of this province are moving out and fleeing.

As we took over as the third party after the election, we made a conscious decision that we were going to put some of these ideas forward. We just completed, for those members who haven't had a chance to read it, our pre-budget report. I sit on the finance committee and we spend a great deal of time with our research people, after we listen to the presentations, going through and outlining what we would do.

In it we talk about the things that we believe need to be done, everything from welfare reform—and again, to give the government some credit, we had called for some of the measures that the government is starting to implement a year ago in our pre-budget report. We talked about everything from the WCB to the tax structure. We talked about some of the issues that we believe, if the government acted upon them, would make this a little bit better province.

It's been a frustrating period of time over the last little while to put some of these initiatives forward. Last year, we said that in the absence of some radical measures, the government would condemn this province to a future with fewer jobs, less investment, more debt and higher taxes, and that is exactly what happened over the last year.

To put it in perspective, our accumulated deficit is now hitting about \$8,000 in this province for every man, woman and child. If you look around and see the people sitting in the Legislature, everybody here owes \$8,000. That's for every man, woman and child.

On the issues over the last little while with the debt, when you put the accumulated effect together and add it with the federal government's, which is in debt to the tune of probably in the neighbourhood of \$17,000 for every man, woman and child, when you add it up, we're well over \$25,000 in debt for every man, woman and child in this province. That's the debt we owe.

As our leader, Mr Harris, said in one of his speeches, "Christmas is a time when parents pay for things and children get something for nothing. Deficits are when the parents get something for nothing and the children pay for it." If you look at the accumulated deficit, it's over \$25,000 for every man, woman and child. I'm married with three kids and the debt that we owe to the federal and provincial governments is more than the mortgage we have on our house, and that's the legacy we've left over the last little while.

In the last election Bob Rae went around saying: "Don't worry. We can have all the spending and we can even have more with the Agenda for People." In that election campaign we were the only party that said, "We are not going to make promises we can't keep." Mr Harris showed me during that campaign that he is a politician who says the same thing before the election, during the election and after the election.

The reason we feel so confident about our chances in the next election is that we are outlining our policies now to the people of this province. Not everybody in this province, the 10 million people who are out there, is going to agree with everything. Even in our party there's some disagreement. But very clearly in the next election the people of this province will know where we stand, and we will have a mandate to make the changes that are necessary to improve the standard of living and quality of life of the people of this province.

I don't blame all of the problems on this government. They inherited one heck of a mess from the previous government. But now is the time to look at the alternatives, to put together some of the practical, commonsense solutions to make this province better.

As 30 seconds is left of my time, I will wind it up and say that even if this government doesn't act on any of the recommendations, I believe 1994 is going to be better than 1993, because in 1994 we will be one step closer to removing Bob Rae and the NDP government, and the great socialist experiment in the province of Ontario will end. That has got to be the best thing that can happen in the province of Ontario.

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** It's a pleasure to join in interim supply, because interim supply, as the people who are watching might know or might not know, is an opportunity where members of the Legislature really get to be able to contribute something to this august place.

As I've said in the past, this place is somewhat of an anachronism. It's run by the Premier, a couple of cabinet ministers and several backroom people, yet the people of this province have elected 130 members, and their views are really of no consequence when you have a majority government. In fact, we sit on committees and we bring forward, as is the role of the official opposition, efforts to try and improve legislation that we feel we can support and it's immediately crushed by the majority members on the committee.

Until we change that system, much of what goes on in this place will really be of no consequence to the average Ontarian. Maybe part of the problem we've got in this province is that we are operating in a system that perhaps was good for people in maybe the 1900s, but as we move into the 21st century is not something that serves the people of this province well.

I often say to the people in my riding, "Why do you elect 130 members to the Legislature and pay for them when only about 5% or 6% have anything that they can do or say?"

My leader, to her credit, has put forward a very clear platform as to how we would reform this place, how we would empower the members of this Legislature, whether they be in opposition or government and give them the opportunity to in fact act on behalf of the citizens of Ontario as opposed to just having this select group and this oligarchy that I speak of being the people who make the decisions.

More often than not, they're not based on what's good for the province of Ontario; they're based on polling

results that are paid for by tax dollars and that are kept secret by the government in power, of whatever political stripe. They make these pieces of public policy based on what's politically sexy and what will keep us in this job, which is a great job. There's no heavy lifting. It's out of the rain. I urge the Premier to call the election before the municipal election because I figure that will at least give you guys an opportunity to get a job again where there will no heavy lifting and you'll be out of the rain, because you're all going to be gone.

We have so many very serious concerns to address in this province. We have problems dealing with young people who are involved in drive-by shootings in Ottawa, with the tragic death of a person who was totally innocent. We have incidents like that happening every day. The government would say: "That's the Young Offenders Act. It has nothing to do with us." Well, it does, because if your policies here are not geared towards dealing with these people, and corrections is a provincial responsibility, then you're not going to see just that take place, but you're going to see even more serious problems take place.

We hear about swarming in Metro Toronto where shopkeepers are not safe, where shoppers are not safe. What do we see happening? Young offenders just continually keep doing this. The police are so frustrated. They arrest these kids and find that they're given a pat on the head, and the next thing they know, they're back out arresting them again.

One of the most serious problems we have in this society is the question of law and order. Unless we address that, unless we're prepared to look at innovative ways to deal with young offenders and tell them, "You can't do that, and if you do, you're going to have serious consequences," we are going to have some very serious problems in this society.

Instead, what does the government deal with? They don't deal with the question of how to come up with innovative ways to deal with corrections and perhaps even what's being suggested in Manitoba—I suggested that about 20 years ago and somebody told me I wasn't a Liberal—that if young people are going to keep getting in trouble with the law, then what you do is create some form of military unit, perhaps part of the armed forces, and you place them in it. You teach them a trade, you teach them some discipline, so they're not back out on the streets causing havoc to the people of this community and the province of Ontario. I think the people are very concerned about that.

We look at the United States. For some reason, we seem to think that the United States has all the answers. The problem we've got is that we don't bother looking at the United States and saying, "Hey, they've got that problem because of this and we're going to change our policy so we don't get into that problem." We're going along merrily thinking that we're better than the United States. We've always been about five years behind them and now it's down to about two and a half years. We are going to have the same things, where you're going to be living in an armed camp in the south Bronx where, if you don't own a gun, you're dead.



Yet this government has not approached this issue at all. They have not done anything for kids with learning disabilities. I have gone through presentence reports of young offenders, and almost to the main, these kids' reports said the kid had a learning disability that went undiagnosed, untreated, undealt with. This government has not even addressed that issue.

Instead, what do they take up their time with? They take up their time with trying to find innovative ways of putting their hands into the pockets of the taxpayers of this province in the most innovative ways. My colleague has spoken about the \$50 fee for filing a corporation return when nothing's changed in the document. They don't even look at the rationale of why you file it. The purpose of the filing is to be able to tell who the directors of the corporation are and so on.

1740

They're offering photo-radar to the people of Ontario and they're saying this is something that is going to be good for law and order. I've spoken at length on this bill and it is the most machiavellian bill. I don't think the drafters of it ever heard of the Magna Carta or the right to be presumed innocent. It's in fact a tax grab. That's all they can see.

They're not prepared to put on the formulary the most recent drug for schizophrenics, who not only present a difficulty in terms of the street people and the problems in the street, but also cause their parents and their loved ones great concern because they can't deal with them: Risperidone. I spoke to the Minister of Health about that and asked her to put it on the formulary. First of all, she didn't know what the drug was, which I found astounding as Minister of Health, and secondarily, she did not feel that it was necessary.

Most of these people, because of our whacko Mental Health Act, wind up going like a revolving door into the hospital, out of the hospital, on to the street, back into the hospital and so on. They don't have any money. Most of them are probably on social assistance, so it's very important that they be given Risperidone or the most valid treatment that they can get, and I understand that's the best one. I understand, in reading some articles from the Ontario Friends of Schizophrenics that they've had discussions with the government but thus far it has had no effect.

The children's aid societies of this province, of my particular region, the region of Peel, one of the fastest-growing regions in probably Ontario or Canada, are by statute required to look after the children who are being neglected. How can they possibly do that when the Treasurer of the province reduces their grants, tells them they're going to have to take 2% less this year and 2% less next year? How are they ever going to possibly deal with that mandate—which they do out of the goodness of their hearts, many of these people; they've worked for long periods of time without perhaps having the appropriate funding.

I have dozens of things I could talk about because I think the real issue here is, are the taxpayers of this province getting the dollar value that they put into paying 130 of us or are they in fact getting what the pollsters

would like them to hear about and give to the government so they can get re-elected?

Finally, my Conservative friends in the third party talked about their plans and that the people of Ontario will give them their support in the next election. If there was one message that was said loud and clear in the federal election it was that the people of Canada, Canadians as a whole, are not right-wing people. In fact, we now have Preston Manning Jr as the leader of the third party—Mr Harris. He talks like Manning. He doesn't look like him, but he talks like him; I don't know whether Manning plays golf. But surely when it becomes a choice for the people of this province, they're going to reject the government because they just spend until you haven't got any money—

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** Talk about election arrogance.

**Mr Callahan:** As long as you have cheques—  
*Interjections.*

**Mr Callahan:** They believe that as long—

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr Callahan:** The NDP believes as long as you have cheques in your chequebook, you have money in the bank.

The Conservatives are now trying to give us Preston Manning revisited. I think the telling fact that the Conservatives, the Conservatives I know, who are not right-wing but are red Tories—Sally Barnes, who was the executive assistant to former Premier Davis, wrote an article which said it in spades. The Conservative Party, with taking that approach, are leaving half of the Conservative Party out to dry and the only people they can support, quite frankly, unless they stay home, would be the Liberals. They're certainly not going to support the New Democratic Party.

So I say that I really look forward to an election. We need it. In fact, one of my colleagues was saying that when we heard Bob Rae, the Premier, talking about a possible election, somehow a ray of light went on over here. I think a ray of light went on around the province too. People were saying, "Hey, we're finally going to get rid of him."

I think it's going to happen, it's going to eventually happen, and unless this government gets smart, they're going to have to run for municipal office or they're going to have to go back out in the cold and in the rain and get back to heavy lifting.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** It looks like on this holy Thursday, as we wrap up the parliamentary session just before the celebration of the Christian feast of Easter, the government has asked us to wind up the debate and vote it the funds necessary for it to operate the government over the course of the next few months. Before that vote, I want to take an opportunity to put just a couple of matters on the record as they relate to supply and therefore the conduct of the government over the course of the past few months and what we might expect in the future.

I begin with the recalling of remarks made by my friend from Renfrew North in his speech on interim

supply, in which he quoted a standard maxim, or an old maxim, as he refers to it, which says, "No supply without a redress of grievance." I think if we were to have to put our grievances on the record here in this Parliament, it would be perhaps months, if not years, before the government was able to actually have a successful vote for supply. So I'm not going to go through all of the grievances. I just want to touch on a few before we take that vote.

I guess the grievance that strikes me most profoundly, and I think it strikes the people of Ontario most profoundly, is the grievance with a political party that promised one thing and did another, a grievance that says, "What you told me you would do, the commitment that you made to me as a voter during the last election, is not what you delivered once we invited you through the electoral process to form and operate a government." Every single excuse has been used by the leader of the government and his ministers and his caucus members in order to avoid those commitments.

As I recall the speech of my friend from Brampton talking about the potential of a September election and the desire of the people of Ontario to actually get on with the election, I am reminded that there will be yet one more promise broken. You won't need to listen to Focus Ontario on Saturday night, where the Premier goes on for some half-hour before eloquent journalists like Robert Fisher and Paula Todd and William Walker, to find out that there's not going to be an election in September. The Premier has said, "It's a bunch of BS." Now, that's parliamentary, because that's what he said on Focus Ontario: "The idea of a September or fall election in Ontario, that's a bunch of BS created by journalists."

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** What does BS stand for?

**Mr Sorbara:** Well, you'll have to ask the Premier that. They're his words.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The member for York Centre has the floor.

**Mr Sorbara:** When the Premier says the idea of a fall election is a bunch of BS, I'm wondering how the Premier gets out of this commitment. What commitment? wonders the government House leader. Well, the commitment of the former Leader of the Opposition, the member for York South, Bob Rae, now Premier of Ontario, who used to preach all over Ontario that governments had a moral obligation, once the four-year period was up, to take their record to the people. It wasn't a matter of advantage. He used to describe the Premier's right to decide when an election should be, I think appropriately, as the divine right of Premiers, which ought to be eliminated from the constitution of Ontario. He used to say in this Legislature, as elsewhere, that a government had a moral if not constitutional obligation to govern for four years and then go to the people.

Now, if my counting is right, that would mean there would be a moral obligation that Bob Rae has, come September of this year, having completed four years, to take his record to the people. If you have a moral obliga-

tion, it's not a question of whether it's opportune, or whether we've completed all our business, or whether the economy has turned around sufficiently. It goes beyond that, in the words of Bob Rae, Premier of Ontario. It has to do with a moral obligation, something that goes beyond the politics of the day.

1750

You could get out of the promise of public automobile insurance, and you could get out of the promise to eliminate Sunday shopping and all the other foolish, stupid promises that were made in the last campaign, because you come to government and you see that the real world of governing is much different. But those weren't moral obligations; they were rather facile political commitments.

What he described as a moral obligation was the responsibility, after four years, to go back to the people. He used to describe, as I said, the unique and I think offensive power of premiers to fix the date of an election at a time which is convenient for government. I find that offensive. I've always found that offensive.

I have thought for years and years that in Ontario and in Canada we should have a regular term for Parliament that required elections every four years, at the same time every four years. We should be doing that, considering legislation to that effect in this Parliament, because we see once again that even the man who said there's a moral obligation to go back to the people is going against his word and is saying that the idea of having a fall election is just a bunch of BS created by journalists. He violates a moral principle that I thought he would incorporate into the high quality of government, the integrity in government that he promised in his first throne speech.

I would naturally have assumed, given that Bob Rae thought it was a moral obligation of premiers to govern for four years, not three, like the stupid Liberals did—I agree that was stupid. The moral obligation, according to Bob Rae, is to go after four years. But no, Bob Rae now says: "That's a bunch of BS. We're not having a fall election."

The bad news, the first grievance, is that even on questions of morality this Premier is not a person of his word. It translates into a Premier without morality, at least when it comes to what was a moral obligation before the election of 1990 and the rigours of governing, as Bob Rae suggests it is right now. He will have to—

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** Go talk to your friend about what's moral.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The member is not even in his seat. Interjections are out of order.

**Mr Sorbara:** I hear a voice from Scarborough Centre, I think it is, soon no longer to plague this Legislature, whenever we get around to having an election.

**Mr Owens:** We're going to talk about Patti Starr and a moral compass.

**Mr Sorbara:** So that is my first grievance. Just before coming into this House I got a sort of foretelling of what we're going to hear from our dear friend the member for York South, the Premier of Ontario, in his annual visit to Focus Ontario. That's a personal grievance, because I



think four years is the right time. The people have said to me over and over again in every community I go to, "Will you please tell us when the next election is going to be, because we're ready to vote now." But that's more of a political grievance.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The member for York Centre has the floor.

**Mr Sorbara:** Whenever they start to catcall, you know you've touched a nerve, and I think we have touched a nerve here.

The greater grievance by far is the abominable state of the Ontario economy and the deterioration of the Ontario economy during these past four years.

In part, I am with the Premier on this one, at least to the extent that we cannot blame all of Ontario's abysmal economic performance over the past four years on this government. The thing that drives me to distraction, though, is that they will take no responsibility at all in acknowledging that many of their policies and many of the bills they've brought to the Legislature and many of the inconsistencies in their manner of governing have added significantly to the economic deterioration and the frightful level of unemployment and underemployment in Ontario. The truth is that in any undertaking in life, until you acknowledge the reality of the situation, you cannot effect positive change.

I have never blamed Bob Rae and his government for every economic woe in Ontario, but I have had an opportunity over the past couple of months to travel around Ontario on a jobs task force that my leader, the member for Fort William, launched back in January to hear directly from the people of Ontario what the problems have been in economic development and job creation in Ontario and to ask their advice about what should be done. We heard suggestions, many, many of which were positive and many, many of which will be incorporated into the report we will soon be presenting to our party and this Legislature and the province.

What astounded me in what I heard is the extent to which people have lost a sense of confidence in our ability to perform, and how they say that the lack of direction and the lack of positive governance from Queen's Park has deteriorated the overall sense of economic confidence in Ontario. A part of it is not knowing what's coming next.

I go back again to the crazy debate on Sunday shopping, just one minor thing, but that sort of set the tone. Before the campaign they were against it; they came into government and they brought a bill to close down the stores; then they changed that bill, and then they brought in a bill to open up all the stores. In so many policy areas it was this lack of certainty.

I remember one person in particular who came to our task force, who said, "If we cannot have government that creates a sense of stability, reliability and predictability, you cannot expect us to take the kind of business risks that will create growth in employment in Ontario." I want to repeat those words for my friends over on the other side, on the government side: a government that is

characterized by stability, reliability and predictability. They said: "We don't know what's coming next from this government. We can't rely on what they say, and they've created an atmosphere in which we have no confidence at all that the investments we make in our own businesses and in businesses that might be started—we cannot rely on them, to make these investments."

That's the reason why for four years in Ontario we have had levels of unemployment which are unprecedented except during the times of the Great Depression in Ontario. Let's see now what these great New Democrats, who used to be able to argue so eloquently for strategies of full employment, are predicting. You just have to look at the latest economic projections of the government of Ontario, Bob Rae and Floyd Laughren co-producers, where they say we will have in Ontario for the next three years levels of unemployment at, more or less, 10%. The Toronto-Dominion Bank in its own forecast says it's worse than that: it says 10.5% and 10.6% unemployment until 1997.

What I heard during two months of job task force hearings in Ontario is that that is unacceptable, that the people of Ontario want the next election because they want to bring in a government that will do something about that crisis. The next government of Ontario is going to have to have the capacity to singlemindedly change the atmosphere of economic growth in Ontario so that within a period of five years we're able to cut those figures in half.

I say to my friends on the other side that those are the objectives we are going to set for ourselves as we approach this next election, which regrettably, if the Premier is to be believed, has been postponed for another six or seven months, into some time in May or June of next year.

But whenever it comes, I know one thing for sure, from what I've learned: There are grievances beyond belief around Ontario, and it has to do with the economic climate created by a government which is inconsistent, which is unreliable, which is unpredictable and has created a destabilization of economic activity in Ontario the likes of which we have never seen. That will come to an end, and it will come to an end when this government is defeated.

**The Acting Speaker:** This completes the time allotted for the debate on interim supply.

Mr Laughren has moved a motion for interim supply for the period commencing April 1, 1994, and ending July 31, 1994. Is it the pleasure of the House that Mr Laughren's motion carry?

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

I declare the motion carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Pursuant to standing order 55, I wish to indicate the business of the House for the coming week.

On Tuesday, April 5, we will debate an opposition day

motion standing in the name of Mrs McLeod.

On Wednesday, April 6, we will consider Bill 143, regarding Ottawa-Carleton.

On the morning of Thursday, April 7, during the time reserved for private members' public business, we will give second reading to Bill 144, standing in the name of Mr Carr, and second reading to a bill to establish an avian emblem for Ontario, standing in the name of Ms

Murdock. On Thursday afternoon, we will consider An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, Bill 138.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** May I take this opportunity to extend to all members of the House a happy, safe and joyful Easter weekend.

It now being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 5, at 1:30.

The House adjourned at 1803.





## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 31 mars 1994

### AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC

#### ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1993 modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail (renforcement),</b> |      |
| projet de loi 129, <i>M. Morrow</i> ,  |      |
| deuxième lecture . . . . .   | 5303 |
| Adoptée . . . . .  | 5319 |
| <b>Loi de 1993 sur les ententes portant sur l'extraction d'eau,</b>              |      |
| projet de loi 126, <i>M. Elston</i> ,  |      |
| deuxième lecture . . . . .   | 5310 |
| Adoptée . . . . .  | 5319 |



# CONTENTS

Thursday 31 March 1994

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

### Workers' Compensation Amendment Act (Re-employment), 1993, Bill 129, *Mr Morrow*, second reading

|              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| Mr Morrow    | 5303, 5310 |
| Mr Mahoney   | 5304       |
| Mr Tilson    | 5306       |
| Mr Kormos    | 5307       |
| Mrs Caplan   | 5309       |
| Mr McLean    | 5309       |
| Mr Cooper    | 5309       |
| Mr Abel      | 5310       |
| Mr Mammoliti | 5310       |
| Agreed to    | 5319       |

### Water Extraction Agreements Act, 1993, Bill 126, *Mr Elston*, second reading

|              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| Mr Elston    | 5310, 5318 |
| Mr Murdoch   | 5312       |
| Mrs Mathysen | 5312       |
| Mrs Caplan   | 5314       |
| Mr McLean    | 5315       |
| Mr Cooper    | 5316       |
| Mr Tilson    | 5316       |
| Mr Klopp     | 5317       |
| Mr Duignan   | 5318       |
| Agreed to    | 5319       |

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### Public consultation

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Ruprecht | 5319 |
|-------------|------|

### Fire safety

|                  |      |
|------------------|------|
| Mr David Johnson | 5319 |
|------------------|------|

### Grimsby hawk watch

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Hansen | 5320 |
|-----------|------|

### Gasoline prices

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Miclash | 5320 |
|------------|------|

### Jack Morris

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Runciman | 5320 |
|-------------|------|

### Events in Niagara region

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Ms Harrington | 5321 |
|---------------|------|

### Premier of Ontario

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Daigeler | 5321 |
|-------------|------|

### Heritage conservation

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Tilson | 5321 |
|-----------|------|

### Jobs Ontario

|         |      |
|---------|------|
| Mr Abel | 5321 |
|---------|------|

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

### Health insurance

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Mrs Grier     | 5322 |
| Mrs Sullivan  | 5323 |
| Mr Jim Wilson | 5323 |
| Mr Runciman   | 5324 |

### Olympic athletes

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Ms Swarbrick | 5324 |
| Mr Ramsay    | 5324 |
| Mr Arnott    | 5324 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Public opinion polls

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Bradley  | 5325 |
| Mr Charlton | 5325 |

### Child care

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Beer   | 5326 |
| Mr Silipo | 5326 |

### GO Transit meeting

|         |      |
|---------|------|
| Mr Eves | 5327 |
| Mr Rae  | 5327 |

### Ontario economy

|         |      |
|---------|------|
| Mr Carr | 5327 |
| Mr Rae  | 5327 |

### Business practices

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Phillips | 5328 |
| Ms Churley  | 5329 |

### Tourism industry

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Mr Arnott    | 5329 |
| Ms Swarbrick | 5329 |

### Long-term care

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mrs Haslam | 5330 |
| Mrs Grier  | 5330 |

### Services for the disabled

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Crozier | 5331 |
| Mrs Grier  | 5331 |

### Truancy

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| Mrs Cunningham | 5331 |
| Mr Cooke       | 5331 |

### Water quality

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr O'Connor | 5332 |
| Mr Wildman  | 5332 |

### Human Rights Code review

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Curling | 5332 |
| Ms Ziemba  | 5332 |

### Closing of campground

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Mr Runciman  | 5333 |
| Ms Swarbrick | 5333 |

### Racial harmony

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr White  | 5333 |
| Ms Ziemba | 5334 |

## MOTIONS

### Private members' public business

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Charlton | 5334 |
| Agreed to   | 5334 |

## PETITIONS

### Sexual orientation

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Murphy  | 5334 |
| Mr Duignan | 5335 |
| Mr Arnott  | 5336 |
| Mr Tilson  | 5337 |

### Firearms safety

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| Mr Tilson      | 5334 |
| Mr Offer       | 5335 |
| Mr Gary Wilson | 5336 |

## Land-lease communities

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Mr White     | 5334 |
| Mr Mills     | 5335 |
| Mrs Mathysen | 5336 |

## Violence

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| Ms Poole | 5334 |
|----------|------|

## Police use of force

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Runciman | 5335 |
|-------------|------|

## Haemodialysis

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Mr Jim Wilson | 5335 |
|---------------|------|

## Landfill

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Tilson | 5336 |
|-----------|------|

## SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

### Township of Glanbrook Act, 1993,

|                             |      |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Bill Pr63, <i>Mr Morrow</i> |      |
| Mr Morrow                   | 5337 |
| Agreed to                   | 5337 |

### Township of Huron and Village of Ripley Act, 1994, Bill Pr78, *Mr Elston*

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Curling | 5337 |
| Agreed to  | 5337 |

### Town of Bothwell Act, 1994, Bill Pr89, *Mr Hope*

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Hope   | 5337 |
| Agreed to | 5337 |

### City of Kingston Act, 1994, Bill Pr91, *Mr Gary Wilson*

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| Mr Gary Wilson | 5337 |
| Agreed to      | 5337 |

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

### Interim supply, *Mr Laughren*, notice of motion number 23

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Runciman | 5337 |
| Mr Curling  | 5340 |
| Mr Turnbull | 5343 |
| Mr Daigeler | 5346 |
| Mr Tilson   | 5347 |
| Mr Offer    | 5350 |
| Mr Carr     | 5352 |
| Mr Callahan | 5353 |
| Mr Sorbara  | 5354 |
| Agreed to   | 5356 |

## ROYAL ASSENT

|                         |      |
|-------------------------|------|
| The Lieutenant Governor | 5345 |
|-------------------------|------|

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Annual report, Commission on Election Finances

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| The Speaker | 5319 |
|-------------|------|

### Members' privilege

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| The Speaker | 5322 |
|-------------|------|

### Business of the House

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Charlton | 5356 |
|-------------|------|

Continued overleaf



No. 107

N° 107

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 5 April 1994

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mardi 5 avril 1994

Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



*50th anniversary*

**1944–1994**

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 5 April 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 5 avril 1994

The House met at 1333.

Prayers.

## INTRODUCTION OF MEMBER FOR VICTORIA-HALIBURTON

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the chief election officer and laid upon the table a certificate of a by-election in the electoral district of Victoria-Haliburton.

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):**

"Mr Claude L. DesRosiers

"Clerk of the Legislative Assembly

"Room 104, Legislative Building

"Queen's Park

"Toronto, Ontario

"M7A 1A2

"Dear Mr DesRosiers,

"A writ of election dated the 7th day of February 1994 was issued by the Honourable Lieutenant Governor of the province of Ontario and was addressed to Catherine Boyd, returning officer for the electoral district of Victoria-Haliburton, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of Victoria-Haliburton in the Legislative Assembly of this province in the room of Dennis Drainville Esq, who since his election as representative of the said electoral district of Victoria-Haliburton has resigned his seat. This is to certify that, a poll having been granted and held in Victoria-Haliburton on the 17th day of March 1994, Chris Hodgson Esq has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated the 28th day of March 1994, which is now lodged of record in my office.

"Warren R. Bailie

"Chief election officer

"Toronto, April 5, 1994."

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** Mr Speaker, I have the honour to present to you and the House Chris Hodgson, member-elect for the electoral district of Victoria-Haliburton, who has taken the oath, signed the roll and now claims the right to take his seat.

**The Speaker:** Let the honourable member take his seat.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** On March 25 past, the government announced with great fanfare that it was going to help fight youth unemployment in Ontario this summer by creating summer jobs. This is being touted as something which will have a real impact on the problem of summer youth unemployment. I want to set the record straight on this by sharing some important facts.

There are approximately 335,000 university, 930,000

college and 702,000 high school students in this province. That means there will be roughly two million students looking for work in Ontario this summer. The government says it will create, at best, 24,000 jobs this summer. In other words, this government's summer job program will create, at best, less than 1.5% of the jobs Ontario students need.

There are fewer and fewer part-time jobs available for students in Ontario, and that's because more and more people who cannot find full-time work are resorting to part-time work. With an overall unemployment rate at 11%, part-time work has in recent years become very attractive for Ontarians who are desperate for any kind of work they can find.

To add insult to injury, this government has increased tuition fees by 42% for college and university students since coming to power, this from the party that promised to freeze and even eliminate tuition fees. This means that, at a time when students will need still more money to go to college and university, they will very likely find themselves shut out of the summer job market. University tuition fees will increase to over \$2,200 in September, which, it is important to understand, represents only one fifth of the total cost of \$10,000 required to attend university out of town in Ontario today.

Viewed in the overall context, this government's summer job program is at best a feeble effort. What it means is that hundreds of thousands of Ontario students will not find work again this summer.

RUTH ATKINSON HINDMARSH

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** I join with all members of the Ontario Legislature in paying tribute to Ruth Atkinson Hindmarsh, the grand lady of the Toronto Star, who died last week at the age of 101. She was also the grand lady of Oakville, an incredible lady.

Grand and gracious, kind and gentle, above all, Ruth Atkinson Hindmarsh was concerned about people, especially society's less advantaged. We all remember Mrs Hindmarsh as a very lovely lady. She was kind, courteous and always considerate of others.

She was six years old when her father took over management of the Star and, from that time, her life centred on the paper and later on the Atkinson Charitable Foundation. Mrs Hindmarsh was a director of the Star and president of the Atkinson Charitable Foundation.

She and her husband were not only members of the Oakville-Trafalgar Memorial Hospital's first board of directors and influential in building the facility, but also generous in their financial support.

She insisted her family, rather than buy gifts for her on her birthday, make donations to the Oakville Humane Society.



She and her husband were active in the St John's United Church, where her great-grandfather, Charles Culham, was a founding member. She was also a member of the White Oaks chapter of the IODE.

As one of her grandchildren told me on Saturday, "People will never know all the things she did." She was an incredible lady, an inspiration to us all and we will all miss her.

1340

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Paul Wessenger (Simcoe Centre):** I rise today to draw the attention of this House to the plight of mobile home and land-lease community home owners. As I have stated numerous times, people who lease land for use as a site for their mobile home or land-lease community home are currently being denied statutory protection equivalent to that afforded to other tenants. Many mobile home owners face the loss of their home equity without compensation by the closure of mobile home parks by owners.

There's no logical reason to provide some tenants with a greater legislative protection than others. There surely can be no logical explanation for exposing the equity of the residents of mobile home parks and land-lease communities to greater risk than the average tenant, especially when we consider that the people living in mobile home parks and land-lease communities are usually lower-income earners, many of whom are elderly.

Mobile home parks and land-lease communities provide necessary forms of low-cost housing in Ontario. The 23,000 residents in such communities in this province deserve to have addressed their concerns about security of tenure, weak tenant bargaining power and unreasonable restrictions. My private member's bill, Bill 21, seeks to do just this.

Progress in this regard, however, was halted in committee by my opposition colleagues. The practices of my Tory peers in particular shamelessly demonstrated blatant insensitivity to the plight of these tenants. This lack of cooperation will not soon be forgotten by mobile home and land-lease community home owners.

I would ask the individuals concerned to reconsider their opposition and cooperate in order to provide the additional protection these home owners need.

#### CHILDREN'S SERVICES

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** The Minister of Community and Social Services continues to keep lives on hold. One week he claims he's freezing social assistance rates; the next week he announces that people who live as spouses will receive \$27 a month less this year than last. Blood from a stone, I say.

Day after day the minister reminds us that the budget isn't here yet and continues to state that more than \$13 million must come from programs mandated by the Child and Family Services Act of this province. Even though reminded last week in Young Voices, a report from the Premier's Council, that the children and youth of this province are coping with serious—very serious—issues on a daily basis, he and his staff continue to raise the spectre of user fees for children's services. It's residential

services that are on the block this year; that is, the payment for lodging and food for children in group homes and mental health treatment centres, children suffering from mental illness and behavioural difficulties.

I ask, should we really be thinking about placing a user fee on families in Ontario because they have sick children, because they have children with difficulties? Has this government lost all compassion? Is this NDP government redefining justice?

#### BURLINGTON DAY AT THE DOME

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** A telltale sign that spring is here is when the birds return to Ontario. Among the most famous in North America is the Toronto Blue Jay.

Last night's opening day victory by the Jays was to say thank you to their fans, and tonight at 7:30 will be the fourth annual Burlington Day at the Dome. Burlingtonians will then say thank you to the team that has won two world championships in a row. The Jays will host the American League western division champs, the Chicago White Sox, in what we know will be a thrilling game that will see the Jays off to their third world championship.

As the proud sponsor of Burlington Day at the Dome, I am pleased to announce that proceeds from this night's event will go to help support the work of the Burlington Association for Community Living, which assists adults and children with intellectual handicaps, and will promote its annual fund-raising bikeathon on Sunday, May 1.

We will also have an on-field presentation to John Olerud with Special Olympian and bikeathon chair, Jodi Kaczur, and the Bike-A-Saurus mascot.

The Burlington Association for Community Living helps handicapped individuals become winners in their own personal lives, and this event is just one way in which we can help it keep its crucial bases covered.

I thank all of those who will come out to the Burlington Day at the Dome this evening for a fun-filled time for their whole family and the satisfaction of knowing they have been up to bat for the needy individuals in the great community of Burlington South.

J. DONALD BAXTER

**Mr Paul R. Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings):** Today I rise to bring to the attention of the members of the Legislature the passing of one of our own. J. Donald Baxter died Monday, March 28, 1994, at Prince Edward County Memorial Hospital. He was 83.

He was elected in the provincial election of 1948 and sat in this Legislature from 1949 to 1951. He defeated James Hepburn in the election of 1948 and was followed by Norris Whitney.

He was a councillor in the village of Bloomfield. He was a member of the cemetery board and also a member of the hospital board. He was a member of the Baxter family, which was notorious in Prince Edward county for having one of the largest canning factories, Baxter's canning factory in Bloomfield, Ontario, which eventually became Cobi's, which is the last canning factory that we have in Prince Edward county.

His funeral was held on Thursday, March 31, 1994. I,

on behalf of all the members of the Legislature, send along my condolences to his family and his wife, Helen.

I want to say that he did return once to this Legislative Building, from the time that he was defeated to the time that he died, and he said that he was very honoured to have been a member of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario. He remarked how interesting it was that he could run his fingers through his name there, carved in the granite, I believe it is, on the walls in the downstairs part of this building.

I just want to say that he was a very remarkable man and will be sorely missed by his community.

#### AGRICULTURE LAND

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** During the days of the leadership of Stephen Lewis, the NDP used to worry aloud about the loss of valuable farm land to development, complete with alarming statistics revealing the number of acres disappearing per day.

Indeed, the present leader of the NDP, now-Premier Robert Rae, stood on farm land in north Niagara in August 1990 and proclaimed for all to hear that an NDP government would address this issue urgently and comprehensively by putting an end to the loss of farm land in the fruit belt of the Niagara Peninsula.

To save the farm, however, one must save the farmer. Faced with escalating costs, low prices, ever-increasing competition and difficulty in obtaining financing, farmers in the Niagara region face a financial crisis.

The NDP promised to ease the desperate situation by implementing a policy of conservation easements which would allow owners of the land to continue to farm in a viable fashion while preserving valuable agricultural land located in a favourable climatic zone for the use of future generations. This would be a significant step in the development of a revitalized Ontario tender fruit industry.

Now in the fourth year of its office, the NDP knows that it is time for its government to translate its talk into action. The time for conservation easements for Niagara farmers is now.

#### ONTARIO ECONOMY

**Mr Chris Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton):** I'm honoured to take my seat in this Legislature as a representative for the people of Victoria-Haliburton. I intend to carry out my legislative duties to the best of my abilities, using the interests of my constituents as my guide and my conscience.

Throughout the by-election campaign, I had the opportunity to meet thousands of people from all walks of life. The most prominent issue on their minds was the fragile state of the economy. People all across my riding are looking for a sign of hope from their political leaders. Their confidence has been shaken, and it is the responsibility of the provincial government to restore a sense of hope and a vision of prosperity which will inspire job creation.

The program that I campaigned for during the by-election was a road map for economic renewal based on restoring common sense in the political process. Government must serve and work for the people, not the other way around. They must have the courage to prioritize

government spending in a way that demonstrates to the taxpayers that their money is being spent wisely. As the members of a compassionate society, we have an obligation to help people who are truly in need.

On March 17 I was chosen to work on behalf of the people of Victoria-Haliburton and I intend to do that. I truly thank them for the honour and privilege. I would also like to thank my family, and especially Marie, for their support, and thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

1350

#### HANSARD REPORTING SERVICE

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** I stand up today to acknowledge Hansard's 50th anniversary celebration.

As a familiar name given to the official reports of debates in Parliament throughout the Commonwealth, Hansard derives from Thomas Hansard, a printer who in 1811 became the first person officially sanctioned to publish reports of debates in the British Parliament.

It was on February 23, 1944, that the first transcript of a complete sitting of the House was produced. The report was prepared by shorthand writers and typewritten with onion-skin carbon copies made for distribution to the Premier, each cabinet minister and the party leaders. The final page bore the signatures of the four Hansard reporters testifying before a notary public "that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of what has been said in the session."

Today, a staff of about 50 transcribes the tapes and edits, formats and indexes the debates on computer. The cassettes, recorded in five-minute segments, are transcribed on networked personal computers. Copies of any part of this original transcript are available to members on request as soon as that segment is completed.

After name verification, reference checks, quotation matching and other research to ensure an accurate record, the final version of each afternoon sitting is dispatched to a commercial printer by modem about 9 pm, only three hours after each sitting adjourns.

Ontario Hansard has progressed from being distributed as a few carbon copies on onion-skin paper for a select group to today's transmission via computer and electronic media, available to anyone in Ontario.

#### VISITOR

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to join me in welcoming to our chamber this afternoon, seated in the Speaker's gallery, the member of Parliament for Scarborough Centre, Mr John Cannis. Welcome.

#### MINISTER'S COMMENTS

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Last Wednesday, the member for Parry Sound (Mr Eves) rose on a question of privilege concerning remarks made in Tuesday's question period by the Minister of Housing (Ms Gigantes) that the member for Mississauga South (Mrs Marland) was "attempting to stall, delay and impede" Bill 120. The member for Parry Sound indicated that the remarks, which were made in the course of a response to a supplementary placed by the member for Mississauga South, amounted to a breach of privilege and a contempt of the House and imputed pejorative motives to the member for



Mississauga South. The government House leader (Mr Charlton) and the member for Bruce (Mr Elston) also spoke to the matter.

I have had an opportunity to review and consider our Hansard for last Tuesday and Wednesday, together with our precedents, the parliamentary authorities and standing order 23(i), on the imputing of false or unavowed motives to another member.

By way of response to the member's concern, I will say at the outset that it addresses a matter of order rather than a matter of privilege. I say this because an allegation by a member that another member is imputing motives or using unparliamentary language should be brought to the attention of the Speaker by way of rising on a point of order instead of a point of privilege. I refer members to citation 485(1) of the sixth edition of Beauchesne, which reads as follows:

"Unparliamentary words may be brought to the attention of the House either by the Speaker or by any member. When the question is raised by a member it must be as a point of order and not as a question of privilege."

On a related matter, the proper time for a member to rise on a point of order is immediately after the event to which it relates has occurred. The Speaker, in turn, must then deal with it immediately. As Speaker Cass indicated on page 89 of our journals for April 20, 1970, a point of order "must be raised the moment the alleged breach of order occurs and dealt with immediately." In the case of the remarks made in the course of last Tuesday's question period, the member for Mississauga South rose immediately after they were made, and the matter was then dealt with immediately on the basis that it posed a question of order. Question period then resumed.

On Wednesday, I indicated that I would review the remarks in light of the submissions that were made. It is clear from Tuesday's Hansard that when the minister made the remarks quoted at the outset of this ruling, she did not make an association—adverse or otherwise—between the conduct attributed to the member for Mississauga South and the purported motive for that member's conduct. The very wording of standing order 23(i) requires such an association to be made for there to be an infringement of the rule on imputing false or unavowed motives.

In the absence of any indication in Tuesday's Hansard as to what kind of imputation, if any, was being offered by the minister, and since all members are presumed to be honourable, I must find that the remarks did not offend our rules.

If I have any lingering reservations in so finding, it is because the remarks could be construed to be provocative, and as I have suggested on a number of occasions, greater respect could be shown in this House for the spirit of our rules respecting unparliamentary language. In this regard, let me quote from a ruling of Speaker Edighoffer, who made the following remarks (at page 62 of the journals for December 7, 1987):

"The Chair must appeal to members not to approach their work with a view to trying to go as far as they can

without breaching a standing order or a rule of this House. Especially as it pertains to unparliamentary language, there is no fixed list of what is parliamentary and what is unparliamentary."

In closing, I thank the honourable member for Parry Sound, the government House leader, the honourable member for Bruce and the member for Mississauga South for rising when they did last week.

MEMBER FOR VICTORIA-HALIBURTON

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: Perhaps I might have the permission of the House to simply welcome the new member for Victoria-Haliburton.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Agreed? Agreed.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I remember with some emotion my first day in this Legislature, as well as in the House of Commons, both of which I entered at a by-election.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Sitting in the back row?

**Hon Mr Rae:** In answer to the inevitable heckle from the member from Etobicoke, yes, I did sit in the back row. If I'd been any further back, I would have found myself in the Ottawa River on my first day—

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Not a bad idea.

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Rae:** —where many people would still like me to be.

Let me say to the honourable member that in my only meeting with him, I enjoyed his company a great deal. We were spending money in what is now his constituency and I was very glad to be doing so. His experience as the warden of Haliburton will come much in handy as we discuss issues that are of great importance to him and to his community. I know that all of us in the House, on an entirely non-partisan basis, would like to share with him our sense of opportunity.

I must say that listening to his comments today, I think there are things he said that all of us can readily agree with. We might disagree on some of the ways in which we implement his particular dream and the preoccupations of his constituents, but certainly I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him personally on his victory, to congratulate the Conservative Party for its win and to say that I look forward very much to working with the new member.

I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr Hodgson's family, who I know are in the gallery. I can only imagine the pride and joy which they share on this day. It's one we all share with him and with them.

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** I would join with the Premier in welcoming the new member for Victoria-Haliburton to this Legislature and say that I know it is important for all of the constituents of Victoria-Haliburton to once again have representation in the House.

It was indeed a tough and a well-fought campaign, with very strong local candidates; I'm sure the new member would agree to that. I'm sure we would all agree

that we were appreciative of the dollars that the Premier spent in Victoria-Haliburton on behalf of all the constituents of that riding.

I too, as do all the members of my caucus, look forward to the contributions that the member will make in this House on behalf of the constituents of Victoria-Haliburton.

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** Obviously, our party and our leader, who cannot be here today, are absolutely thrilled, on behalf of Mr Hodgson, to say that we look forward to working with him as he represents the electoral district of Victoria-Haliburton in the House, and to say that Chris especially is a family person who took this task very seriously when he went into the campaign. He's noted for his ability to work. He has a track record in his riding and he's very much looking forward, as we are, to the contributions he will make as the member representing Victoria-Haliburton.

I thank all of you, Mr Premier, the leader of the Liberal Party, for your welcome. We've welcomed him unofficially and now we're doing it officially.

**Mr Chris Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton):** I'd like to thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and our deputy leader. What the Premier of the province has said brought back some memories. He's got a good memory; it was an excellent day. I look forward to working together to bring more things to our riding and to work with all the members of the House to improve the lives of all people in Ontario.

1400

#### ORAL QUESTIONS SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question is for the Minister of Finance. Minister, we have now reached the first anniversary of the social contract. It's a year later, and in spite of all the chaos that social contract has created, we do not yet see a lot of evidence that the taxpayers are going to realize all of the savings you promised.

We have certainly seen a number of cases over the last weeks where employers have been forced to hire temporary staff to fill in on the Rae days that are being taken by the permanent staff. We've had the example of corrections staff where they've had to bring in contract staff in order to replace the permanent workers who are on their Rae days. We are hearing from ambulance operators who are telling us that they're being forced to hire temporary staff to cover the Rae days that their permanent workers are taking. We know about Metro Toronto spending \$800,000 to cover child care workers while they are on their Rae days.

I would ask you today, Minister, if you can tell us, exactly how does the hiring of temporary workers to cover the Rae days actually save the taxpayers money, and can you tell us how many employees are being replaced to cover those Rae days and exactly how much that is in fact costing the taxpayers?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I appreciate the question from the leader of the official opposition, because perhaps it can remove some of the

chaos that resides within her own mind concerning the social contract.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Can't I use the same language the leader of the official opposition uses, in response to her question?

What needs to be clearly understood by people is that for a transfer agency out there, whether it's a municipality, a hospital, a school board or an ambulance operation, the transfers from the province to those agencies or partners have already been reduced, so the taxpayers of this province have seen a reduction in our transfers to them and subsequently a reduction in provincial taxes flowing from that so that we did not have to raise taxes this year.

That doesn't deal with the question of, what if that transfer agency then hires someone to replace someone who's off on a social contract day, to use the more appropriate term? The fact is that it's not in the best interests of any organization out there to backfill that way. They still have to make up the difference. So if they manage their affairs in such a way that they have to replace people who take social contract days, they're hardly managing their affairs in their own best interests.

**Mrs McLeod:** I thought the question was, where is the real saving and what's the real cost? I'm not sure I heard a response to the question, so I'm not sure the Minister of Finance has done anything except add to the chaos. I would suggest to the minister that if he wants to find out about the chaos that has been created, and it is not in my own mind, all you need to do is talk to any public sector employer, any public sector employee, talk to any two hospitals, any two school boards in the same community, any two municipalities, and you'll find out what sheer chaos you've created.

But I suggest to you that if you can't answer the question about what the costs are and the savings are for your transfer partners, the school boards and hospitals and municipalities, you might at least be able to answer some questions about whether you've achieved your real savings, your own savings targets in your own operations.

We've been told by government officials that your own social contract savings will be off target by at least \$250 million. The question then is, is that in fact the total shortfall or is there more to come, more that's going to be revealed on how far short of your targets you are? When are you going to give the public a full accounting of how many hundreds of millions of dollars you've fallen behind in reaching your own social contract targets, and what will that do to the deficit in your next budget?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I've made a commitment—

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** Do you understand the question?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Yes, I understand the question. I know you're commenting on what you think my intelligence level is, but that's quite appropriate coming from you.

I've already indicated that there will be some slippage on the social contract savings because of some things we



did with the municipalities, Ontario Hydro and so forth. But we will, by and large, achieve the vast bulk of our savings, because we've reduced our transfers to our agencies out there and we are restructuring the public service in this province, which was long overdue and which no other government had the nerve or the courage to tackle. That's what we've done that you never did.

Finally, I must say that I will continue to repeat, as often as I need to, that our taking \$2 billion in savings through the social contract was preferable to what the leader of the official opposition said she would do, which was to cut services by another \$2 billion. That's what she said.

I would just say to the leader of the official opposition that we will achieve the vast proportion of our savings, keeping in mind it's \$2 billion a year for each of three years. Those are very substantial savings to the taxpayers of this province.

**Mrs McLeod:** I'm more than happy to not only speak to my commitments but to answer to them. I'm trying to get the Minister of Finance, on behalf of the government, to speak to their commitments, their savings and their costs.

This minister talks about restructuring.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for Durham East.

**Mrs McLeod:** I suggest to the minister that he is carrying out his restructuring in some rather interesting ways, because it seems that at the same time that employers are being forced to bring in part-time staff to cover the Rae days and you're trying to hide the fact of \$250 million in missing social contract savings, you are spending more taxpayers' money to set up new offices with 50 employees to implement the social contract. My understanding is that this new social contract empire includes a secretariat, something called a productivity savings office, and that it is going to cost taxpayers at least \$2.5 million for salaries alone. It seems that only the New Democrats would build a new bureaucracy in order to bring about spending cuts.

Minister, why do you refuse to tell the taxpayers of this province exactly what you have saved and what the social contract has cost? Is it because the savings just aren't there?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I've said many times, and I said it in my first supplementary today, that there would be a full accounting of the social contract savings in the 1994 budget. But I would just remind the leader of the official opposition, because I don't think it should be a luxury that she enjoys to be able to stand up day after day and criticize without ever having an alternative of her own, that she said was opposed to the \$2 billion in tax increases in last year's budget. She's opposed to the \$2 billion in savings in the social contract. That's \$4 billion right there. Presumably, the leader of the official opposition would have either increased the deficit by \$4 billion this year or slashed and savaged services in health and other public services to the tune of \$4 billion in this province in the very year we are now in.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mrs McLeod:** Mr Speaker, I hope the minister is not under any illusions that the social contract is not resulting in a loss of service, because if that's his belief, he is living in a very different world than people across this province.

#### CANCER TREATMENT

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** Since the minister has demanded alternatives from the opposition party, I am more than happy, in a second question to the Minister of Health, to talk about a set of recommendations and alternatives that we've proposed to the government.

Minister, my question to you is on the issue of cancer care in the province of Ontario. You will be well aware that last January we presented the report of our task force on cancer care. In that report we made a number of recommendations to you, as government, for actions which we believe need to be taken immediately to deal with a pending crisis in cancer care.

1410

We understand that you are about to announce a cancer care strategy. We are encouraged by this, because one of our key findings in our task force work was that there does need to be more coordination to make sure that cancer care patients are getting the very best care they can. Our key recommendation to make sure that coordination was in place was that a provincial agency be established to manage cancer care.

I ask you today, as you look towards an announcement of a cancer strategy, are you prepared to act on that key recommendation and will you establish a cancer control agency as part of an overall strategy to be announced this week?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** The Leader of the Opposition points out that shortly I will be releasing the cancer strategy that has been the product of a great deal of discussion: round tables around the province, discussion with the providers of care, with the survivors of cancer and with their families. I appreciate the fact that the member realizes we need a coordinated plan for cancer, something that during the previous government was not even contemplated or embarked upon.

In response to her specific question, no, I am not prepared today to discuss some of the findings of our discussion and, no, I am not prepared to precede the release of the strategy by giving the details to the member today.

**Mrs McLeod:** I must take exception to the minister's suggestion that there were no plans in place for coordinating cancer care in the province prior to the New Democrats coming into office and would remind the minister that there was in fact legislation being prepared to put in place a cancer control agency. The plans for that kind of coordination have been in place for some three and a half years now.

Having said that, I again appreciate the fact that following our task force report it became apparent that the government was prepared to move ahead on this very urgent issue. But, Minister, I want to also draw to your

attention that there are other very urgent issues we raised in our task force report, and they're issues that need to be addressed immediately.

You will recall that last November I asked you about the length of time it takes to get approval for cancer drugs that are not now on the drug plan. I specifically asked you about the eight weeks that cancer patients have to wait for approval to receive the drug that's known as GCSF. I know you're aware that patients who need this drug need it immediately, they need it urgently, they don't have eight weeks to wait. When I raised this question with you on November 30, you told me you would look into the situation, that you would take steps to fix what is truly an intolerable situation.

I ask you today, because this is such an urgent situation, what have you done to follow up on that commitment, and why are cancer patients still waiting an average of eight weeks to get approval for this drug?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I would dispute the eight-week wait. My understanding is that in fact there is significant coordination and implementation of the recommendation and our view that that was too long a wait.

In response to what has happened, let me assure her that we have appointed within the ministry a cancer coordinator, Dr Les Levine, who has been working with the treatment centres and looking at the improvement of the situation. If in fact there are instances of an eight-week wait for approval of a drug, I would entirely agree, as I did with the member the first time she raised this, that that was too long, and I will look into it and make sure steps are taken to make sure that average is significantly reduced. It is my understanding that in fact it has been.

**Mrs McLeod:** I have already said that I appreciate the fact that Mr Levine was appointed in order to bring about a coordinated cancer care strategy. That is not a response to the more immediate and very urgent issue of shortening the waiting time to get funding for those urgently needed cancer drugs.

When I asked the question at the end of November, you indicated very clearly that you would seek confirmation as to whether that was the waiting list. You cautioned me not to take it on advice of a doctor in a public hearing that nine weeks was in fact the average.

We understand from ministry staff today that the average wait to get the approval for drugs under section 8, the special approvals, is indeed eight weeks. We understand that there are simply not enough ministry staff to even begin to process the number of requests for approval that they're getting.

I am shocked and disappointed that four months after you committed to confirm that this is a problem and to deal with it, there is still no assurance from you that anything has happened and that the waiting list is still an average of eight weeks.

I say to you that this is a very simple, a very straightforward and a very human problem. These people need the drugs, they need them immediately, they need to be able to combat the infection, and in fact there is cost-effectiveness if they get the drug because it means they

don't have to be hospitalized.

I ask you again, will you commit to fixing the approval system so that patients can get the drugs they need when they need them?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** There is no question that that needs to be done, has to be done, and has been done. If the ministry is informing the Leader of the Opposition today that there is an eight-week waiting period for some drugs in some cases, then that is certainly something I need to know about and to investigate, because I agree with her completely: That is too long.

When she says there aren't the staff to process the applications, I take issue with that, because that has not been a difficulty. I will certainly take the information she has given me and confirm with the ministry that that is no longer the case. It ought not to be.

#### NON-PROFIT HOUSING

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** My question is for the Minister of Housing. I have obtained a confidential memorandum from two senior managers of the City of Toronto Non-Profit Housing Corp. This memo tells the corporation's board about the status of the Jarvis-George development project.

The memo predicts the project will come in almost \$1 million over budget, possibly as much as \$1.5 million. Construction prices are 16% more than the maximum unit price for Toronto. Fees for lawyers, consultants and architects are over budget by more than \$250,000.

Here we are 16 months after the auditor reported that these same problems were widespread in the non-profit housing program, and they're still happening. The Ministry of Housing must approve these cost overruns and other irregularities. Minister, why is your ministry turning a blind eye to this evidence of gross mismanagement?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** The ministry is not turning a blind eye to gross mismanagement. First of all, the ministry does not turn a blind eye to any difficulties that arise in the social housing program. Second of all, I cannot indicate, with her, that this is a question of gross mismanagement.

I would be prepared to respond to the member's question by providing a full answer with full details about the project, perhaps tomorrow, if that's suitable.

**Mrs Marland:** Of course the Jarvis-George project cost overrun will mean a larger mortgage than anticipated. This confidential memo also tells us, and I quote, "The Ministry of Housing regularly approves mortgage adjustments of this nature, even if total capital costs exceed maximum unit prices."

In another revealing statement we learn, and I quote again, "Cost overruns on Cityhome's own projects have always been covered by mortgage increases approved by the Ministry of Housing."

The Housing ministry's practice of looking the other way has to stop. Minister, will you give us your commitment today that you will not allow these practices to continue?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** The member is suggesting that



there is something unusual and impossible and unethical going on in the social housing program, which is simply not the case.

There are cases of housing developments where, because of environmental problems which have arisen, or because of delays in the approvals process, or because of OMB hearings that have been required, because of neighbours' questions about a development, for a variety of reasons, there are projects in the past some of which have taken two, three, four and, some, five years to develop, where costs have arisen which are above the maximum unit prices, and certainly those have been discussed openly with the public accounts committee. They have been discussed openly in this Legislature since I have become minister.

But to suggest that there is anything unethical going on here, which is what I think she is trying to do, is simply nonsense. What is done in each case is that a review of the project is undertaken to decide whether the merits of the project warrant the investment that has been made and whether that investment should be continued, as opposed to just shutting it down and writing off costs.

1420

**Mrs Marland:** I am wondering if I should raise my point of order now about the minister accusing me of saying that something was unethical when in fact I didn't say anything was unethical, or shall I leave it and let it go for today? Obviously, for this minister, who doesn't have the answer, she has a great deal to say.

Let me tell this House about another statement in the memo that is puzzling and disturbing. Bear in mind, this is not my memo. It's an internal memo in one of the organizations that this minister supports very strongly.

The authors write that even if the ministry does not approve a mortgage adjustment for the project, Cityhome doesn't need to worry. Listen to this:

"Cityhome, as a developer of properties for other groups, has made earnings on a number of those projects. For example, Cityhome undertook the development of 11 Coatsworth for Stephenson Senior Link and earned approximately \$1 million on the land and construction. Another \$1 million was earned on the development of the 48-unit seniors' project for the MTHCL at Coxwell-Hanson. The accumulation of these amounts in Cityhome's unrestricted reserves is a possible source of funds to pay for the potential contract losses."

Obviously, this sounds like Cityhome made \$2 million in profits from acting as a developer and can use that money in any way it wishes. Minister, is this the case—that's one question—and, if so, why is this program called non-profit housing?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** The member is asking me to confirm statements in a memo which she says exists. I don't know whether it exists or not. But I can just say to her that when a non-profit organization such as Cityhome decides it will act as a development consultant, which it has a perfect right to do, and earns a fee for that, no matter what it may be called and no matter what piece of paper or so-called memo the member may have access to, it is still reserves of a non-profit organization, because

Cityhome itself is a non-profit organization.

To suggest that there is something wrong with this process betrays an enormous naïveté and lack of understanding about how non-profit organizations work, what they do in order to generate fees, because many of them do this kind of development consultancy to the very great benefit of other non-profit organizations and to the benefit of the public of Ontario.

#### ADVERTISING

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** I'd like to address my question to the Premier. Considering your past history, which you spoke about earlier in welcoming the member for Victoria-Haliburton, I would ask if you still believe in freedom of speech and those people you defended when in opposition, and I suppose at times in government, the right to freedom of speech or in fact just demonstrating against the government of the day, allowing these people to have their say in a democratic society, which we are so lucky to live within. Do you still believe in that, Mr Premier?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I wonder if the member could be more specific in his question.

**Mr Stockwell:** Just to quickly recap, Mr Premier, do you believe in free speech? I assume that everyone in this Legislature would believe in free speech and the democratic principles. If you still believe in freedom of speech, why are you banning these signs from rural Ontario? These signs are being put up on private property in agricultural areas by the owners of these properties, putting these signs up in demonstration against your government's policy to unionize farm workers.

I ask you, as a person who in opposition was, and as a Premier is, a defender of democracy, a defender of freedom of speech, why are these signs being removed from agricultural private property as an expression of those people who own these properties?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I've seen the sign he is looking at. For those of you who haven't seen it, it has a picture of me, looking very, very grim, facing one way, and a picture of a benign-looking donkey facing the other way. It's one of the few times that my picture and that of—no, I won't say it. I'll leave it alone.

I would just say to the honourable member that I've seen that poster. I believe it's downtown at the corner of Bay and Gerrard streets, and I think I saw it in the member for Huron's riding the other day when I was visiting him there, so I've certainly seen the sign around. Apart from that, I'm not aware of any limitations on free speech that would be in order. I don't think they would be in order at all.

**Mr Stockwell:** To me, this cuts to the basic rights of a democratic society. Although this particular billboard is not a billboard the government would agree with, I'm sure, it does allow for freedom of speech and basically the fundamental reasons we are here in a democracy. These signs were put up, Mr Premier, I say to you directly—I mean, I don't find this the least bit funny. This is very, very dangerous.

The sign police are out in the agricultural communities telling private property owners they may not be allowed

to keep these signs up on their property. They can put up a sign that says "Eat at Moe's" or "Bowl All Night," but they can't put up a sign that talks about freedom of speech and the very essence of the democratic society we live within.

Mr Premier, as a person who embraced Salman Rushdie some months ago and defended his position for freedom of speech, I would ask you directly to intervene in this matter and allow people in the province of Ontario the right to say what they want for freedom of speech and allow them to put signs up on their private property asking governments to change policies, change principles and change legislation.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member conclude his question, please.

**Mr Stockwell:** I appeal to you directly. Call off the sign police and let this democracy be maintained.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I don't support any activity that would restrict freedom of speech in this area. I never have. I don't support it or condone it. Having said that, there may be issues, and I'm trying to think of which ministry it might be, involving some questions of signage. There may be some issues involving highway safety or whatever the reasons may be.

I would say to the honourable member, first of all, that I personally am a very strong supporter of free speech. I have absolutely no objection to people putting signs up as long as they're in conformity with the basic zoning bylaws or other laws that are in place. I can only assume that's the policy overall that governments have followed. If there's an issue here that has to be addressed, I'm sure it will be addressed by the responsible ministries, but I certainly don't object to any signs going up anywhere at all. I don't mind signs going up.

#### ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** My question is to the Minister of Finance and it has to do with the economic outlook for Ontario.

Minister, I gather the budget will be presented in the next two to three weeks, according to what you've said previously in the House. A cornerstone of your economic outlook was that we would be seeing some fairly significant job growth occurring in 1994. In fact, I think when you were before us in January, you predicted that we would see job growth of around 88,000 jobs in Ontario in 1994.

1430

As you will know, Minister, you issued a report about two weeks ago indicating, at least after two months into the year, that rather than job growth we've seen some fairly significant job loss. It was very much a surprise to us and I suspect to yourself.

My question to you is this: As we look ahead at the budget and your economic outlook, have you revised your outlook for job growth for 1994, and if you haven't, how can you explain that we've seen about 10,000 fewer jobs in Ontario in the first two months of the year and how do you explain how we are going to get to the very significant job growth you predicted in the economic outlook in the remaining months of the year?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** The member for Scarborough-Agincourt is correct in that the budget will be coming down in the next short while—within the month or so—and it's also a fact that it depends on whether he's talking about a calendar year or a fiscal year. I'm not sure what he was getting at in his question.

But it's also a fact that in January, for example, of 1994, there was a sudden blip on the scope on jobs, in which jobs have been increasing every month and suddenly there was a rather abrupt and strange drop, something like 41,000 jobs in one month. Now that, since then, has come back up in the month of February, and there was positive job creation in the month of February. So I think that most of us in government and private sector forecasters scratched their heads over that January figure but feel that the recovery is still ongoing and that there will be positive job creation in 1994, as there was in 1993.

**Mr Phillips:** I won't get into a long debate with the minister about numbers, but I do think that if you look at your own report, after two months we see 10,000 fewer jobs in the province than we saw a year ago. You have been predicting that we would see significant job growth and a declining unemployment rate. There's something going on in the economy, Minister, that indicates that your forecasts may be off.

The second part of your economic outlook indicated that we would see low interest rates for the foreseeable future. In fact I think you predicted continually declining interest rates. Certainly as I look at this document—the minister's shaking his head, but this document predicts interest rates continuing to decline and indicates that you base your housing start projections on a declining interest rate.

This is my second part of my question. I think there are some significant questions around your employment numbers. What impact will what appears to be a rising interest rate rather than a declining interest rate have in terms of your economic outlook and therefore, of course, on the budget that you're presenting, I gather, in two to three weeks here in the Legislature?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I noted with some interest comments made by the Governor of the Bank of Canada, speaking earlier today here in Toronto, in which he indicated that it was still his belief that the federal government's projection on interest rates would be achieved, which is in the 1% to 3% range, and that we have been forecasting an inflation rate somewhere between 1% and 2% until the tobacco tax debacle come down around our ears, which meant that the inflation rate dropped even more for 1994.

With the recent events in the money markets, of course, and interest rates getting bumped up again, there's no question that if the trend in interest rate increases were to be dramatic in the future, that would have a dampening effect on the recovery of the economy. There's no question about that.

But I would remind you that as the Governor said today, given the capacity for expansion within the economy, we should not be concerned about the rate of



inflation going out because of the capacity that's still there in the industrial sector, not just in Ontario but all across Canada. So we're still anticipating positive job growth and economic growth in virtually every sector and virtually every measurement of economic growth in Ontario this year.

#### WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** My question is for the Minister of Labour. Minister, urgent action is necessary to deal with the WCB's unfunded liability. As you know, it has now ballooned to \$11.6 billion and the number continues to grow.

Indeed, if we recall, the auditor, in his 1993 provincial report, urged you to develop a plan for dealing with this problem as quickly and efficiently as possible, and in another recent report, the Canadian Bond Rating Service identified the WCB's unfunded liability as a cause for serious concern which could raise the province's debt rating level.

Minister, you must act now to reduce this massive unfunded liability. Given the fact that the Premier's Labour-Management Advisory Committee for reaching a joint labour-business solution to the crisis reached an impasse on Friday, will you tell us today what action you now plan to take to deal with the unfunded liability?

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** The member, I'm sure, will be anxious to hear our arrangements to deal with the unfunded liability. I can tell her that we are working on it right now, and I can also tell her, though, to put this in the proper perspective, that the 1993 increase is the lowest in 10 years in the unfunded liability, and that the increase was \$1.2 billion in 1991, was \$6.8 billion in 1992 and with this following year at \$5.4, it is going down. It's not acceptable, but it is going down, and we will be dealing with it.

**Mrs Witmer:** It's obvious that the Minister of Labour doesn't have any plan for dealing with the problem, and I'd like to follow up on a comment that was made by the Premier, who said he'd like to send the bill for the WCB to the Liberals.

I think we need to remember that the financial crisis at the WCB is in part due to the expansion of coverage that was introduced by the previous Liberal government through Bill 81 and Bill 162. These bills index benefits, they change compensation for permanent impairment and they alone added more than \$3 billion to the unfunded liability. So yes, we should send the bill to the Liberals.

However, I ask you, Minister, are you going to be proceeding with policy changes to expand the scope of coverage such as compensation for chronic stress? Are you going to continue to add to the financial woes of the WCB which are contributing to job loss? Will you give the employer and employee community in this province your commitment that you will not introduce any more policy changes at this time until you deal with the unfunded liability?

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** I want to assure the honourable member that we will try to deal with both the unfunded liability and other problems that we've been aware of at the WCB for a good many years, and that is the approach

of this government, and I think very shortly the member will see some of the steps we're prepared to take.

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** You are killing jobs. How can you say that? They won't locate here.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Simcoe West.

1440

#### CARDIAC SURGERY

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** My question is to the Minister of Health. Over the years there have been concerns about waiting times for cardiac surgery. In the late 1980s, there were problems in Ontario with access to cardiac care. Today in the 1990s, people are still concerned. There has been concern in my own riding of Peterborough. Minister, can you tell me where we are at in terms of managing cardiac care in the province?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I'm delighted to have an opportunity to address this question because it's one, I think, in which a lot of us have very real concerns, but in Ontario waiting times for heart surgery have decreased since the late 1980s to an average of just over a month for bypass surgery. We know this from the results of the first study of the system that has been done by the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences and was released just last week. These results show that waiting times across Ontario have dropped, the resources are used effectively and that patients who need urgent treatment receive priority treatment.

In the past, doctors had no common definitions or criteria for rating patients and so we established the provincial adult cardiac care network in 1991 to manage the waiting list. The study that was released shows that it has in fact done its job, that we've improved the system, we're using our resources more effectively and that hospitals, doctors and the ministry are working together to improve the system.

**Ms Carter:** With regard to the study that you mention by the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences, my constituents will want to know about the outcomes of this study. Does it tell us anything about the value of different procedures so that we can use our resources more wisely? What does it mean for patients and their families?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I think it's important for all members of the House to be aware that in this study and in many others, the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences has proved its value because we are in this province now for the first time examining the outcomes of the procedures and the services that we provide.

As the member has stated, people in the past have not known whether in fact we ranked well or poorly with the procedures and the treatments that we provided. What the study that ICES has just released means is that we can now assure the people of Ontario that they can be confident that they receive outstanding cardiac care in Ontario. It showed that there is still some room for improvement, but we will work to make those changes.

I know as well as anyone how stressful it can be when somebody is on a waiting list for cardiac surgery and I hope that this study will reassure people that we have a system that we can all be proud of and that this kind of

a success story will show us the value of having an institute and of doing outcome studies as we struggle to spend every health care dollar as effectively as possible.

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights):** I have a question for the Premier. When you and your minister announced that you were reorganizing the trade and investment activities of the Ontario government, which included the closing of 17 foreign offices, your Minister of Economic Development and Trade announced that the new strategy calls for greater coordination and cooperation of activities by the provincial and federal governments. Your minister went on to report to this House that she had led a trade group to the International Auto Exposition in Frankfurt and in cooperation with its federal counterparts, Ontario, for the first time, operated exhibit space for seven Ontario-based automotive companies.

On March 22 to 25, the largest trade show ever held by Canada outside of Canada was held in Mexico City. The show was attended by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, Minister for International Trade Roy MacLaren and Industry minister John Manley and had over 400 Canadian exhibitors. Of those 400 exhibitors, 184 of them were from the province of Ontario.

Mr Premier, could you tell this House why there was no official Ontario presence at this show?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I can tell the honourable member that because the government concluded that there was so much representation, including representation from the federal government, from the Prime Minister and others, there was simply no need.

**Mr Kwinter:** I have heard the Premier make comments and say things, but that has to rank as one of the silliest comments that I've ever heard him make.

Mr Premier, given the importance of international trade to this province and given the fact that Mexico is the third-largest market for the United States and has the potential to be a major trading partner of Canada, do you not think that your government was irresponsible in not coordinating the presence of the Ontario participants by at least having identifying logos on each Ontario company's booth so that visitors to the show could see that nearly half the exhibitors at this major show were from Ontario? And do you not think that you could also have had a booth promoting Ontario as a place to do business, as well as booths for the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, both activities that have a very, very high potential in Mexico? All of this could have been done at very little relative cost but would have presented Ontario as the major economic force that it is in Canada.

Mr Premier, do you not agree that this was a missed opportunity, and does it reflect the indifference that this government has to international trade opportunities in the future?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I go to countries overseas, I suppose, as frequently as any Premier in the history of the province, for which I am roundly criticized by many, including the honourable member from St Catharines, who's the

first to criticize. We have a delegation representing Canada overseas, a major exhibit in Mexico City, we have three federal cabinet ministers, one of whom, the Minister for International Trade, represents the constituency of Etobicoke North in Toronto, and now we have a member of the Liberal Party opposite saying, "Why didn't you send more cabinet ministers from Ontario to duplicate what is already being done?"

I will continue to represent the province and to be aggressive. In fact, just at lunchtime today I was meeting with people, discussing what we will do. But I would say to the honourable member that we have to be effective and intelligent in the use of public dollars, unlike some other things which have been done.

#### AGRICULTURAL LABOUR POLICY

**Mr Chris Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton):** I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. The member for Victoria-Haliburton with his question.

*Applause.*

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** That will be your last applause.

**Mr Hodgson:** I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. In rural Ontario, and in particular Victoria-Haliburton, we have a number of concerns over the threatened unionization of the family farm. In my constituency, they cannot understand why your government is proceeding with Bill 91. Can the minister please tell us why the government again appears determined to unionize our family farms?

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** First of all, I'd like to welcome the member for Victoria-Haliburton, who's kind of a neighbour of mine in terms of his riding. Certainly, welcome to this House.

I think perhaps what the member should do is a little bit of research on the family farm. What he calls a family farm from his riding and my riding is usually a small farm that's run by the family members. Very seldom do they actually have a hired person on the farm. In some cases there are dairy farms, very few, that do have hired people on a regular basis.

There's no attempt by this government whatsoever to unionize the families who actually work on these farms. The member has absolutely nothing to be concerned with. He should look at this bill, which was put together by a task force which included farmers and labour as well as government. Those recommendations have been accepted and will be dealt with when Bill 91 comes before this House.

**The Speaker:** Supplementary, the member for S-D-G & East Grenville.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** It's obvious the NDP don't understand teamwork.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The government benches are



asked to come to order so the member for S-D-G & East Grenville can ask his question.

1450

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** It's quite obvious that Bill 91 is not fully endorsed by government members as well. When this legislation first came forward from the Minister of Labour—and that, in our opinion, is the wrong ministry to start with—it was supposed to be separate from Bill 40. Indeed, in other than a few very specific reasons, it is an extension of Bill 40, which is very dreaded by the entire rural community. The message came through loud and clear during the by-election in Victoria-Haliburton.

If this government intends to proceed with legislation for which there is no demonstrated need, and there is no demonstrated need for Bill 91, will this government at least honour its commitment for separate legislation under the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs? That's what this is all about.

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** There's a lot of information out there in the public. Not all of it is accurate when it comes to Bill 91. I know that we're going to have a discussion about an opposition motion this afternoon dealing with Bill 91 and I hope that in fact everyone can stay with the facts as to what Bill 91 is about and what the government intentions are in terms of amendments to that bill.

There is not, I repeat, a lot of fear in rural Ontario about this bill. If there are any fears out there, they're based on misinformation and stories from people who either do not understand what the bill is about or do not talk to farmers and rural organizations as to their input to this bill and their further input in terms of what amendments will be brought forward.

I don't think any farmers have any reason to be concerned, certainly not the family farm, whether it's in Victoria-Haliburton or down in Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry.

#### SCHOOL FACILITIES

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** My question today is for the Minister of Education and Training. Over the past couple of months I've received hundreds of letters from my constituents requesting support and help in getting a new building for St Stephen's Secondary School in Bowmanville.

The community support for this school is overwhelming. The school began with 50 students. It now has 450 students and by September this year will have 500 students.

My question, Mr Minister, is this: Is there anything in the works at this time to modernize the facilities at St Stephen's Secondary School in order to accommodate all the students?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I appreciate the question by the member, who has talked to me about this particular school accommodation question many, many times. I would just tell the member that at this point all of the school boards have set their priorities for submission to the Ministry of Education and Training in terms of what they think should be funded, what their priorities are and what the

needs are.

Obviously, overcrowding, age of school buildings, all of those issues are taken into consideration when the regional offices are making recommendations to the ministry. That's where the issue stands at this point and, as soon as decisions have been made, I can assure the member that he will be the first to know.

**Mr Mills:** Thank you very much, Mr Minister. The Catholic community in Bowmanville definitely needs a permanent, up-to-date school facility which will provide the students with the same opportunities that are provided to other students. Can you tell me whether or not Bowmanville will indeed be provided with a new building for St Stephen's Secondary School?

**Hon Mr Cooke:** The ministry has to rank all of the capital requests from all the school boards in terms of need. The member will know that the school boards submit close to \$2 billion worth of requests for capital each year and there's about \$300 million allocated. The ranking is being done now, and as soon as those decisions are made the member will of course be informed, but the information that he and the school board have provided us has been very helpful.

#### AGRICULTURAL LABOUR POLICY

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** My question is for the Minister of Labour. I'm going to try a different minister here and see if we can get an answer.

Minister, two weeks ago you said you would be bringing forward some housekeeping amendments to deal with the concerns that farmers right across Ontario have about Bill 91, the agriculture labour legislation. Farmers not only in Victoria-Haliburton but in Northumberland and right across Ontario have been telling you about the problems with Bill 91 since it was introduced last spring. Nine months later we are still waiting to see your amendments.

Minister, where are these amendments, if in fact there are any? Will the amendments finally implement the agriculture labour task force recommendation to give farmers a separate agriculture labour act instead of putting them under the OLRA, Bill 40?

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** We've had an agricultural labour-management advisory committee looking at the bill, looking at the suggestions that have been made. They have brought in some recommendations. We will be dealing with those recommendations very shortly.

**Mrs Fawcett:** "Very shortly." "In the future." Farmers, Minister, are very suspicious about your motives with Bill 91. The minister will be aware that farmers are counting on some kind of legislation to give them protection from strikes, since the NDP took the agriculture exemption out of the Ontario Labour Relations Act with Bill 40.

Bill 91 doesn't give farmers the protections they need. There are no amendments in sight, and the minister won't even give a commitment as to what the amendments will contain. Maybe, just maybe, this is because Bill 91 didn't make it on to the NDP's A or B of issues to be dealt with before this next election.

Minister, farmers are looking for changes to Bill 91 that do more than prevent strikes from taking place. Will the minister's amendments include provisions for a quick-response mechanism to ensure that any illegal labour disputes are stopped immediately?

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** I have seen very few pieces of legislation where there has been more consultation and more involvement of the OFA, of the labour movement and of the ministry. I think that the recommendations that will be made certainly will meet the criteria for a good number of the farm community. There may still be some out there—I'm not sure—who don't like the bill. But I can tell you we've consulted closely and we are listening to the complaints and the recommendations that are being made.

#### RECYCLING

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a question for the Minister of Environment and Energy; it's on the town of Tillsonburg, which has a wonderful name, I might add. Tillsonburg has an alternative to the blue box program that has been running a successful recycling depot since 1991. This depot is currently diverting 12% to 14% of the town's garbage from the landfill site. This diversion rate has generally been more successful than any of the other municipalities around the province of Ontario. Tillsonburg diverts anywhere from 5% to 13% with curbside blue box programs.

My question to the minister is, why are you forcing Tillsonburg to abandon the waste depot program that is working well and forcing the taxpayers of Tillsonburg to spend \$170,000 a year, which they don't have, on a blue box program, with no guarantee that it will improve its diversion rate?

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** I would compliment the member on the name of Tillsonburg and indicate that I wasn't aware he had such a close connection to that community. He is quite correct that the municipal council has expressed some concerns. Ministry staff have met with council to discuss its concerns about the new 3Rs regulations that will be coming into effect for all communities over 5,000 people in the province.

Tillsonburg is committed to waste diversion. We indicated to them that we were prepared to talk to them about alternatives to the blue box. At one point they did suggest perhaps a blue bag program, which is somewhat different, as the member knows, in terms of the way it operates and the need for separation and so on. But if Tillsonburg has other suggestions that would make it possible for them to comply with the 3Rs regulation when it comes into effect, the ministry would be happy to discuss it with them.

1500

**Mr Tilson:** I'm pleased to hear that, because that isn't what the town of Tillsonburg has been saying. The town of Tillsonburg has simply said that you are refusing to exempt it from the blue box program, and in fact the funding—

**Hon Mr Wildman:** It could be exempted.

**Mr Tilson:** Well, that's what they're saying. The

Premier has visited Tillsonburg and has made such a commitment to look at exempting Tillsonburg. They have passed a resolution, as you have indicated, supported by municipalities from all over Ontario, to amend the 3R regulations to give the municipalities more latitude in the methods used to achieve the desired objectives for a reduction of waste being sent to a landfill site.

Will you make a commitment, will you confirm the commitment that was made by the Premier, to exempt Tillsonburg and any other municipality across Ontario that has shown through example that it can achieve reduction without implementing more expensive blue box collections? In other words, will you give the municipalities the opportunity to consider options?

**Hon Mr Wildman:** The member has misinterpreted what I said. I did not say that Tillsonburg could be exempted from the 3Rs regulations when they come into effect. I'm sorry if he got that impression.

We are prepared, as he suggested in the last part of his question, to discuss options that municipalities might use in order to comply with the 3Rs regulation. But the member knows that this government is committed to a 50% diversion by the end of the decade, in comparison to 1988.

We have committed additional funding over the next two years for the blue box program to assist municipalities where funding was running out. We are committed to ensuring that the private sector will contribute more of the share to the cost of the blue box program and other 3Rs projects.

We are prepared to talk about options, but there is no wavering from our commitment to waste diversion and the application of the regulations. Frankly, there is no wavering on the part of the population of this province, which is wholly committed: three million households already on the blue box program.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The time for oral questions has expired.

#### MINISTERIAL RESPONSE

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I require your direction with respect to standing order 33(a). You will know that the last part of that order indicates, "The minister may take an oral question as notice to be answered orally on a future sessional day but where any reserved answer requires a lengthy statement, the statement shall be given under 'Statements by the Ministry and Responses.'"

On March 30 I posed a question to the minister of Management Board on a matter dealing with a retreat taken by the social contract secretariat. The minister at that time undertook to respond to me on that matter and on the matter of a facilitator being paid \$1,800 a day for this particular matter.

To date, the minister has yet to respond to this question, which I believe should be very easily ascertained by him and his office. I'm wondering if this is not really a breach of rule 33(a) and if in fact my rights as a member posing questions in this Legislature on matters which are known to the minister have not been prejudiced by virtue of the fact that the minister has refused to respond to my



question on this date. Now we are moving into, I think, the fourth sessional day having passed without a response to this matter by the minister.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** On that point, Mr Speaker: Me-thinks the member's head is full of too many dreams. I've made a commitment to the member that I will get him an answer to his question, but the member is well aware that he directed the question to the wrong minister. I've explained that to him and I'm awaiting the full details of the answer from the ministry where the operation is located. When I have that information, I will provide it to the member.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** First, to the member for Mississauga North, he will know that the standing order does not specify a particular time within which the minister who has made the undertaking in the House must comply. He has quite properly brought the matter to my attention and at the same time to the minister who is responsible. He has stated that he will provide an answer as soon as possible, and perhaps that will satisfy both sides of the House.

#### PETITIONS

##### CANCER TREATMENT

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly urge the Minister of Health to respond forthwith to the issues raised in the Liberal task force on cancer care, including the urgent need for radiation equipment, addressing shortages in trained personnel and providing adequate information and non-medical services for patients."

I support this and will add my name to the petition.

##### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas traditional family values that recognize marriage as a union between a man and a woman are under attack by Liberal MPP Tim Murphy and his private member's Bill 45; and

"Whereas this bill"—

**Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East):** Where is your bill?

**Mr Cousens:** No, I withdrew my bill. You should realize there were some problems with it and try to find the balance. We have great concerns about this bill, and I'm pleased to read it into the record.

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** Shame.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member present the petition, please.

**Mr Cousens:** "Whereas traditional family values that recognize marriage as a union between a man and a woman are under attack by Liberal MPP Tim Murphy and his private member's Bill 45; and

"Whereas this bill would recognize same-sex couples and extend to them all the same rights as heterosexual couples; and

"Whereas the bill was carried with the support of an NDP and Liberal majority, but with no PC support in the second reading debate on June 24, 1993; and

"Whereas this bill is currently with the legislative committee on administration of justice and is being readied for quick passage in the Legislature; and

"Whereas this bill has not been fully examined for financial and societal implications;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislative Assembly to stop this bill and future bills which would grant same-sex couples the right to marry and to consider its impact on families in Ontario."

I have affixed my name to this bill.

##### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario on behalf of my constituents from Twin Elms in Strathroy. These are leased-lot residents, and they petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

I have most certainly signed my name to this petition.

##### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Hugh O'Neil (Quinte):** I've been asked to present this petition for some of the people in my riding. It says:

"Whereas we, as a God-fearing people, are opposed to the victimization of persons on grounds of sexual orientation; and

"Whereas we, however, believe that attempts to establish and/or promote homosexual relationships as viable alternatives to heterosexual-based families do not conform to God's will for society; and

"Whereas Canadian law, as established by the Ontario Court of Appeal (*Haig v Canada*, 1992) prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to enact legislation to prohibit homosexual persons from adopting or raising children."

##### MINISTERIAL RESPONSE

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas all individuals of Ontario must be treated within the spirit of a free and democratic society;

"Whereas the individuals must be treated by government in a manner consistent with the Ontario/international Human Rights Code;

"Whereas the Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services, Mr Christopherson, is not conducting himself in a democratic manner as a servant of the people of Ontario;

"I, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To instruct the Solicitor General, Mr Christopherson, that his duty in a democratic society is to serve the individuals of Ontario. Should the Solicitor General be unable to comprehend the democratic duties, please have him replaced with a more competent person, with a person more willing to fulfil his or her democratic duty in serving the people of our democracy, to provide fair and reasonable information and reply in a positive manner to positive questions."

That petition is signed by Henry Freitag, Penetanguishene, Ontario.

1510

#### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr Mark Morrow (Wentworth East):** I have one signed by 2,297 residents of Wentworth East:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas all students are entitled to the same educational resources regardless of where they live or which school board they choose to attend;

"Whereas most Catholic schools board and rural boards do not have the assessment base of the public or the urban boards;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act now and restructure the way in which municipal and provincial tax dollars are appointed so that Ontario school boards are funded equally and equitably."

I affix my name to that.

#### CANCER TREATMENT

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly urge the Minister of Health to respond forthwith to issues raised in the Liberal task force on cancer care, including urgent needs for radiation equipment, addressing shortages in trained personnel and providing adequate information and non-medical services for patients."

I heartily concur with this petition and I have affixed my signature to it.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have a petition from Hope Lutheran Church in Kitchener, Ontario.

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Liberal Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of

the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and therefore could include sado-masochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all references to sexual orientation should be removed from the Ontario Human Rights Code and Liberal Bill 45.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

There are several hundred signatories, and I'll affix my signature to the petition.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**M. Gilles Bisson (Cochrane-Sud) :** J'ai ici une pétition de mon collègue le député de Lac-Nipigon. Il ne peut pas présenter la pétition comme ministre de la Couronne, alors je vais la présenter pour lui.

The petition is addressed to Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"I/We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

The petition is signed by a number of people from Marathon—Mr Currie, Mr Joseph, Mrs Bush etc—and I table the petition.

#### VIOLENCE

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I have 16 petitions signed by people in Alliston, Brechin, Collingwood, Port McNicoll, Orillia and Bradford which I would like to read.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;



"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to emulate or admire, but rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

That brings the total over the last week of 1,479 signatures submitted by Catholic women's leagues, the women's institutes and business and professional women's clubs, and I am proud to submit my signature as well.

#### MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I have a petition here. It is:

"Prevention First:

"Periodic health exams save money and lives. Prevention and screening costs less than treatment and cures. Prevention and screening may save your life or the life of a loved one. The government wants to delist this important service. Say no.

"Petition:

"We, the undersigned, believe that all Ontarians should be covered for preventive health and periodic screening procedures. Money will not be saved by delisting preventive health exams."

That's signed by Mrs Anne Wright and Frederick Wright, 216 Shannon Street, Orillia, and I've affixed my name to it.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I have a petition that was presented to me last Thursday night by the residents of Sutton-by-the-Lake, a land-lease community. I have the petition here which reads:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide the needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-leased communities, much like Sutton-by-the-Lake; and

"Whereas many of the owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and the loss of their investment of their mobile home by the action of the landlord,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To move, as expeditiously as possible, to third reading of Bill 21."

It has been signed by many, many constituents, and I

support this and hope that the opposition members tying this up will move it forward quickly.

#### GAMBLING

**Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin):** I have a petition:

"Whereas the government of Ontario has permitted the construction of a casino gambling establishment in the city of Windsor, citing as reasons the attempt to assist border communities hit hard by cross-border shopping, free trade and the proliferation of gambling casinos in surrounding provinces and border states; and

"Whereas the government of Ontario has indicated its intention to permit the establishment of a second casino in the province by a first nation of Ontario; and

"Whereas the United Chiefs and Councils of Manitoulin on Manitoulin Island has publicly declared that it would like to see the first native casino in the province built on Manitoulin; and

"Whereas many Christian denominations across Canada have taken the lead in opposing legalized gambling in all its forms, calling it a regressive tax on the poor and a magnet for criminal activities and warning of the selfishness of gambling; and

"Whereas many church ministers in Windsor, where the first provincially sanctioned casino is slated to open some time in 1995, fear the opening of this casino will lead to gambling addictions and related family and social problems, requiring them to meet the social needs of gamblers and their families; and

"Whereas Manitoulin Island is already known to have a higher rate of social and health problems than the provincial average, including a rapidly increasing crime rate for its population size, especially in the areas of spousal and family abuse brought about, in part, by alcohol-related problems and poverty, both of which could be exacerbated by the establishment of a gambling casino, the premise of which is to make winners of a few at the expense of the majority of losers;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, respectfully ask the government of Ontario to reconsider the establishment of gambling casinos anywhere in the province, and that the government of Ontario turn down the request by the UCCM to build a casino on Manitoulin Island."

This is signed by many of my constituents.

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas several patients from the town of New Tecumseth are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments in Orillia or Toronto;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in New Tecumseth and one patient is forced to pay for her own nurse;

"Whereas the government continues to insist they are

studying the problem, even though they've known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in New Tecumseth and Collingwood,

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of New Tecumseth."

I've signed that petition, I obviously agree with it, and I enjoy the support now of the Liberal caucus, obviously.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Mr Speaker, the time being short, I wish to file with you and the Clerk at the table several petitions dealing with Bills 55 and 56, the Tory bills, and 45 as well.

I have attached my name to them.

1520

#### OPPOSITION DAY

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would ask consent to have the motion read in by Mr Cleary on behalf of Mrs McLeod.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Unanimous consent? Agreed.

#### AGRICULTURAL LABOUR POLICY

Mr Cleary, on behalf of Mrs McLeod, moved opposition day motion number 1:

Whereas in the past family farming operations have been exempted from the provisions of the Ontario Labour Relations Act in order to minimize the impact of disruptive labour disputes which would be devastating to many farm operations; and

Whereas under Bill 40 the NDP government removed the Ontario Labour Relations Act exemption for farming operations, promising to enact separate farm labour legislation; and

Whereas the government created an Agricultural Labour Relations Task Force to study farm labour issues comprised of three representatives of farm employers, two representatives from organized labour, one representative of farm workers, and two staff from the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, who acted as co-chairs; and

Whereas the NDP government has now failed to implement the task force's recommendations in the agriculture labour legislation it introduced; and

Whereas an independent legal review of the legislation found that it does not contain the protection provisions that were promised last year by the Minister of Labour, such as ensuring that immediate relatives of farm owners are not forced to join unions; and

Whereas the NDP government's agriculture labour legislation, Bill 91, fails to protect family farming operations from labour disruptions; and

Whereas agriculture organizations across the province are calling for massive amendments or a total rewrite of the legislation, which the Minister of Labour refuses to consider; and

Whereas farming operations are particularly sensitive

to labour disruptions because of spoilage of crops and the health of animals;

Therefore, the Liberal caucus calls upon the NDP government to redraft its agriculture labour legislation under Bill 91 in order to implement the agriculture labour task force recommendations, or to amend the Ontario Labour Relations Act changes made under Bill 40 to reinstate the previous general agricultural exemption, for the purpose of ensuring that farm families are not forced to unionize their employees, and are not subjected to labour disruptions.

**Hon Shelley Martel (Minister of Northern Development and Mines):** There has been agreement, I understand, among the three parties to split the time evenly, with a vote to occur at about 5:55.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** It has been agreed.

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** No one can deny the key role agriculture plays not only in the economy of rural Ontario, but the entire provincial productive power.

With over \$5.8 billion being generated at the farm gate annually and over \$17 billion in total sales of agriculture products, it is indisputable that agriculture continues to be an economic foundation of Ontario.

Despite these overwhelming figures and the fact that the agrifood industry employs more than one in five jobs, I am surprised and disappointed that agriculture receives minimal recognition and appreciation.

Involved in agriculture all my life, I know that we should all be willing to acknowledge our farmers and farming and work to ensure a healthy agricultural industry for today and tomorrow. This will be no easy feat because farming has experienced some tough times over the past few years. I fear it may continue. I might point especially to the income crunch that happened in 1991 when crop prices fell by over 30% and net income fell by about 15%.

However, I am proud that since 1991, possibly one of the most difficult periods since the 1930s, the industry has struggled to make a comeback. I am also proud to have been part of a previous Liberal government, from 1987 to 1990, when significant increases were made to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food's budget.

I am concerned, however, that the current NDP government is not committed to assisting the industry. The NDP has not provided the assistance they promised in their 1990 election platform, the Hayes task force or their 1992 investment strategy.

In fact, quite the opposite has happened. Far from providing any new assistance, the Agriculture ministry's budget has actually declined since the NDP took office. The NDP has cut back on major provincial support programs in their attempt to control their own financial mismanagement.

It is reported that despite the NDP increasing overall government spending by about 15%, the 1993-94 Agriculture budget is 8% less than when the Liberals were in office. Also, when it took office, the NDP was committed to extending powers to unions, seemingly at any cost.

Testimony to their agenda is damaging Bill 40, which



was introduced to give unions more power and to limit the ability of business to survive in the face of labour disputes. Bill 40 sent a clear message that Bob Rae and his Labour minister were not welcoming business in Ontario. The legislation has forced some businesses to leave the province and caused others to re-evaluate plans to expand and settle in.

Even today, Ontario continues to face plant closures and growing unemployment, despite news that the recession is breaking elsewhere in the country. In light of this ongoing hardship it seems incredible that the NDP now plans to wade into a new swamp and attack the province's second-largest employer by attacking the agriculture industry through labour legislation called Bill 91.

Instead of attacking the farmer community with this legislation, why can't the Agriculture minister, as well as the Labour minister, help farmers in a real and meaningful way?

To cite just one avenue that could be considered, there was a group of farmers in my riding who were very interested in operating a provincial park that was closed a number of years ago. They had a number of potential investors. They had good ideas for operating these parks. They would promote tourism and offer employment opportunities. But the NDP government is simply not willing to assist in job creation and economic renewal for eastern Ontario. Instead they are focusing on introducing more legislation and hindrances across the board.

1530

Also in my riding in eastern Ontario, there is the Seaway Valley Farmers Energy Cooperative, an energetic group of farmers committed to developing a made-in-Ontario ethanol fuel industry. I am confident that everyone is familiar with this group and the merits of ethanol fuel, which promises to be positive for farmers, the environment and our non-renewable resources. Even my good friend the member for Chatham-Kent, who appears to have recently discovered that ethanol makes good headlines too, is willing to applaud the merits of this industry.

Yet are the ministers of Agriculture, Labour or Economic Development striving to assist farmers in this regard? With confusion surrounding the Cornwall project and, as the member for Chatham-Kent ably pointed out last week, the Chatham project, the answer is no. My advice to the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Agriculture is to clean up the messes already on your plates before you create even larger problems for farmers and the economy through Bill 91.

I must encourage the government to not scheme any further against agriculture and job creation and not unionize the mainstay of rural Ontario: the family farm. Agriculture is already struggling under the weight of low commodity prices, high inputs and an excessive amount of regulation. The last thing it needs is additional legislation which will make it more sensitive to labour disruptions.

Farm groups have made it known loud and clear to the NDP government that agriculture should not be bundled up with every other industry under some central labour

plan. To do this, they first had to fight the NDP's plans to completely wipe out the long-standing agriculture exemptions from the OLRA.

The farming community felt it had made significant headway when the Labour minister agreed in 1992 to set up the Agricultural Labour Relations Task Force. With a membership of farm employers, organized labour, farm workers and staff from the ministries of Labour and Agriculture and Food, the task force was given the mandate to study the unique nature of agriculture in relation to labour reform.

As a result of setting up this task force, farmers were led to believe that the task force would be used as input into the changes planned under Bill 40. Many farmers were surprised when the minister went ahead and introduced Bill 40 before the task force report was finished.

With Bill 40, the NDP removed the agriculture exemption under the OLRA, removing all protection for farmers. Farmers told me this was in bad faith and nothing less than a threat to intimidate them to agree to reforms under the work of the task force.

Largely acting on the defence, the task force ended up recommending a number of specific measures to protect the agriculture industry and the family farm. This included steps to prevent strike action, to exempt family members from collective bargaining, and to have separate legislation, instead of amendments to the OLRA.

It is unfortunate that at a time when agriculture is facing serious problems and when farmers are struggling to survive, the only priority of the NDP government is to bring farmers under the OLRA. What is further astonishing is that the NDP finally brought forward its implementation of the task force recommendations under Bill 91, but it is not what the task force recommended.

Besides learning that the chair of the labour issues coordinating committee sent a letter to the Labour minister to state his disappointment that Bill 91 fails to represent the consensus developed by the task force on many critical issues, I have also been in touch with individual farmers and farm groups.

It is clear now, just as when the legislation was first introduced, that Bill 91 fails to live up to the spirit and the word of the task force recommendations in at least 11 major areas. Amazingly, however, the Labour minister first attempted to deny that his bill differed from the task force report, and he said the legislation was supported by all the involved farm groups.

Since then, a number of key farm organizations and commodity groups have clearly stated that Bill 91 is fundamentally flawed. As a result, the minister now appears a little more willing to admit there are problems. With at least four major farm groups having contacted the minister to express dissatisfaction, I guess it can be said that it takes at least four wake-up calls for the minister to realize the needs of rural Ontario.

Now the minister appears willing to concede that Bill 91 requires some, to quote him, "minor housekeeping." I must say that the Liberal caucus joins farmers across this province in saying Bill 91 requires more than a little dusting and straightening.

Today I would like to join my caucus members in tabling some very specific amendments to fix the structural flaws in Bill 91. I was surprised at the comments the Minister of Agriculture made in the House today, and I must remind him that there are 11 specific questions that need to be addressed before the legislation is acceptable.

—We are concerned that the NDP government has refused to create a separate agriculture labour relations act.

—We are also concerned about and question why the NDP government has refused to create a separate agriculture labour relations board.

—There is significant distress that the NDP has refused to recognize specifically in the preamble of Bill 91 such issues as climate conditions, seasonal variations and the perishability of produce and livestock.

—We are uncertain why the NDP refused to define “agriculture” under Bill 91.

—The NDP must implement provisions to prevent strikes from occurring under Bill 91.

—The NDP should implement the dispute settlement process as recommended by the task force.

—We are concerned that the NDP refuses to implement the task force’s proposed labour-management advisory committee.

—There is anxiety that the NDP has not exempted all family members from requirements to unionize or be subject to the collective agreement.

—Nor has the NDP properly defined “seasonal workers” under the legislation.

—We question why share growers are not adequately protected from being included under the legislation.

—There is also issue with the reason the NDP government has failed to address the health and safety of livestock and crops in allowing access to farming operations for organizing purposes.

1540

It is clear that the failure to implement all or any one of these task force recommendations breaks the promise the minister made to the farmers of this province and unnecessarily threatens family farming.

In conclusion, the government has promised amendments. We will be waiting to see if they address the wide-ranging problems we are raising today. Farmers will not support this legislation if the minister fails to fix the bill, and neither will we. The one thing farmers can trust is that if the NDP government continues to refuse our demands to fix Bill 91, we will fix it after the next election and protect farmers and the sensitive agriculture industry from strikes and other labour disruptions.

A Liberal government would give farmers the respect and assistance they deserve, something that has been missing for the last three years.

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** I too am pleased to participate in this opposition day debate. First of all, I want to personally congratulate my new colleague from Victoria-Haliburton. I had the opportunity of doing some campaigning with him during

the time leading up to the March 17 by-election, and I must tell you, out in rural Ontario Bill 91 was first and foremost.

Bill 91, rightly or wrongly—I think mostly rightly—is very much feared by the rural community, and with just cause. It’s interesting that the Liberals would bring in this particular opposition day motion now, because back on July 29, 1993, the Minister of Labour made his announcement that Bill 91 would be forthcoming, and that farmer from Mississauga West—his name is Mahoney, and he has quite a reputation as a farmer—went on for the entire five minutes in reply saying that he didn’t get the documentation in time, and he was chastising the government, but nowhere did he say he was against—there he is—this bill completely. He finished off his comments by simply saying he was dealing with Gord Wilson in an attempt to get the information and that he didn’t get the information, that it was now the 12th hour and it was totally unacceptable.

I accept that, because the Liberals didn’t have a position at that time. They remembered well the Liberal leader making a statement when Bill 40 came in—and Bill 91 is simply an extension of Bill 40; it’s a twin of Bill 40—to the effect that, yes, labour reform was a good idea, but not at that time. I’m not sure when a good time is for the likes of Bill 40 and Bill 91; in my opinion, there is no time at all to bring in this type of anti-business legislation. But that is basically what came forth from the Liberals at that time, and I’m sure the billboard that was referred to—the farmer from Mississauga West?

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: With due respect to the member, I was not speaking as a farmer. I was speaking as a Labour critic. The Minister of Labour had assured us that he was preparing documentation in cooperation with the farm community, and we were simply asking him to deliver what he promised Gord Wilson he would deliver. He failed to do it, and I was doing my job, and I take exception to this honourable member’s remarks.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It’s not quite a point of order.

**Mr Villeneuve:** I appreciate the interjection from the member for Mississauga West. I know there are times when he can get under people’s hides and get their dander up. Maybe I irked his a little bit today, and if I did that, I apologize.

However, that very same day, I had the opportunity to reply for the party I very proudly represent. I’ll quote a little bit right from the end, and I think it summarizes where our party stood on this: “I was hoping [Bill 91] was not coming at all, but it’s here. We have to live with it. Our party is committed, when elected, to repeal Bill 40, and [Bill 91] is part of Bill 40 and will be repealed” as well.

So we’re on the record right off the bat. Why do we not leave Ontario agriculture exempt, as in the past? The question remains.

And if indeed we have to bring in something to avoid the implications of Bill 40 with respect to agriculture, what we should have is a bill in the name of the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, because this is



very much agriculture, food and rural affairs. It involves farming, it involves agriculture, and it involves the processing and the harvesting of crops. The name change, with great fanfare from the Premier, to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs—at least it would have given some respectability to the name change had this legislation been changed and been administered by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, not by the Ministry of Labour.

Agriculture is a very important industry to all of Ontario. Arguably, it's the most important industry to Ontario. I say "arguably" because some claim that transportation is more important to the economy and that agriculture, food and the processing of food is second. I can accept that, except, I say to all members present here, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food is more important when it comes to: can you do without food or can you do without that second car or that industry? Maybe we, as agriculturalists and farmers, will win hands down on that one.

However, we will not waste any more time on that particular area. It's simply a matter of the importance of agriculture and food production to all of this province.

Bill 91 was brought in with some fanfare, and a task force was set up. The task force did report to the Minister of Labour; however, it seems it was not heard very clearly, because we now have in the brief to the Ontario cabinet by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture—and I have a copy. There are great concerns over the lack of changes to Bill 91.

I know the Minister of Labour is going to tell me that, yes, the task force recommendations are now going to be brought forth. However, in the legal jargon of attempting to meet the requirements of an industry that has to make hay when the sun shines, that has to look after animals seven days a week, 365 days a year—it is a totally different ball game than if we're talking about the steel industry or the mining industry or the car industry. We are dealing with food production: Food has to be harvested when it's ready, the planting has to be done in a timely fashion, and of course the livestock-related activities all have to be done in a very timely fashion.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** The cows have to be milked twice a day.

**Mr Villeneuve:** Of course the cows have to be milked twice a day.

I don't want to cut in on the time allotted to my colleagues, but I will relate an experience I had as a rural real estate appraiser. We were in court one day with the Ministry of Transportation and the learned folks who practise law, the lawyers representing the Ministry of Transportation. It was very interesting. I, as an appraiser, had estimated the value of the real estate. The highway was cutting the farm in a rather odd situation, and that, of course, was the farmer's problem. I was dealing with economic compensation, compensation whereby the cash flow would change to some degree because of the implications of the highway.

This farmer was explaining to the learned lawyer representing the Ministry of Transportation that he indeed

did have some economic loss. He started off with a herd of 40 dairy cows and a complement of young cattle. There were 75 head of cattle on the farm at the beginning of the year and he came up with a net income that was somewhere in the area of \$15,000 or \$18,000, and he finished off with more livestock than he started with.

Of course, the lawyer, being learned in the law, said: "Sir, you started off with 40 milk cows and a total herd of some 75 head of cattle. You're finishing off with 80. You didn't purchase any, and therefore there were some hidden purchases here that would indeed, if they were reported, reduce your net income. Therefore, your total financial exercise is not very accurate."

The dairy farmer simply said: "Look, this is the way it happens on a dairy farm. That's the normal way it happens."

1550

The interesting situation was that the lawyer for the Ministry of Transportation had convinced the judge that indeed the farmer had forgotten to include some purchases. When I was put on the stand, I told him a little more than, "That's the way it was," because I told him that every dairy farmer who's worth his salt and survives expects every cow in that barn to have a calf every year.

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** How does that happen?

**Mr Villeneuve:** It happens through nature, sir. Don't ever forget, you were born too.

But the interesting thing, and I want to get back to the point at hand, is that when the negotiations occur, whenever the Ministry of Labour appoints some people to negotiate with farmers and with groups of people who are the workers, will they understand the unique nature of agriculture? These learned gentleman in the law, this lawyer and the judge, were both convinced that the farmer was pulling a fast one. Neither one even knew that a dairy cow, for the duration of the time she will be in the milk line, has to produce a calf. That is something that is pretty basic.

Yet, I say to the Minister of Labour, if indeed this is the type of legislation that we're going to have to live with, I certainly hope and trust that the people he appoints to mediate know something about agriculture. That's one of the reasons I would have liked to see that the lead ministry here be Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. Can you think of a better name than Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs? Yet the Ministry of Labour will be doing all of the policing, all of the negotiating, all of the arbitrating, and agriculture will have to accept it, because there is no lockout and no strike allowed in this type of legislation.

I think the agricultural community is facing a very real challenge here in hoping that if it has to come—and I again implore the minister, the ministry and the government to exempt agriculture. It worked in the past. We never had to force people to join whatever, including labour unions. They were always able to negotiate. Yes, there would be some unhappiness. There's always a situation where people can walk away from a job and replacement people are there, and if they're not there, then whoever is doing the hiring and the signing of the

cheques will have to up the ante if he or she is looking for some help. It's that simple. Maybe it's too simple.

Our new colleague from Victoria-Haliburton could really emphasize how very concerned his constituents were throughout the entire period of the by-election.

A few of the areas of concern that were expressed by the Agricultural Labour Relations Task Force outlined 11 areas of major deficiency. It's arguable that a bill that is now where it is in the process can indeed be sufficiently amended that the government does not change the intent of Bill 91. If at some point it's decided that Bill 91, as Bill 105—which not only went back to the drawing board but got dumped and was replaced by Bill 42. We maybe should be looking at this particular alternative. Bring it to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs.

For example, there is the failure to create a sufficiently separate statutory framework from Bill 40; the failure to create a sufficiently separate administrative body; the failure to emphasize sufficiently in the preamble the unique nature of the agricultural sector; the failure to define agriculture; the failure to provide adequate enforcement provisions to the prohibition of strikes; the failure to give full effect to the parties' wish for the dispute resolution system of final offer selection; the failure to implement the task force recommendations designed to provide specialized services, educate and give initial support to the affected parties, etc. These are pretty major things.

We had the federation of agriculture, we had the milk marketing board, we had basically all of the farm commodity groups express concern over Bill 91 and the changes to the minimum wages: the tender fruit and vegetable growers, the processing industry. It's always interesting. When you hear of a settlement at GM or at Ford or at Chrysler and the employees got a 2% or 3% or 4% increase, whatever, everybody seems to be happy. Put the price of food up, and with the way the Canadian dollar has gone—this morning it was announced that much of the imports of food from the United States, because of our rapidly falling dollar, are going to increase in cost—we've got everybody upset. That tells you how important the food production and the food sector is to this entire province.

I have at least three other of my colleagues who want to express the concerns that have been expressed to them from their constituents, and I know they can do it in a very, very capable and articulate way. But my concern is, to the minister, I say, if indeed you're going to proceed and attempt to amend this, make sure it meets the needs of the rural food-producing community.

I say to my friends in the Liberal Party, it's nice to see you come on board. We wondered where you were. You're finally taking some stances, and I commend you for that. We now know where you are on this one, and I appreciate that.

In closing, I thank the Liberal Party for bringing this forth. I thank them for the opportunity we will have to reinforce the convictions that have been conveyed to us by our constituencies. Many of us represent largely rural communities and the economy is very dependent on the production, the processing and the distribution of food.

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** I am not by background a farmer, and I don't claim to be any expert at all in terms of farm products, farm production and farm operations. I do, however, have a respect for the occupation. My younger brother is a farmer, but in a beef operation with about 125 cattle. I have some enjoyment visiting with him and seeing what goes on in his particular operation. He's even instructed me a little bit in some of the facts of life that the member for S-D-G & East Grenville was talking about when he tells me the number of cattle he expects to calve that year.

**Mr Villeneuve:** That is why cows have long faces.

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** I want to tell him also that I really believe the people we've had involved in the discussions from the farm community, largely picked, I think, through the federation of agriculture, from the union community, United Food and Commercial Workers representatives, and from the ministry, do have some understanding of the difficulties and problems that may arise. As a matter of fact, I have an awful lot of respect for those who have sat on the committees we've had over the last couple of years as we've tried to deal with this situation.

I'm pleased to have this opportunity to clear the air, if I can—I'm never quite sure in this House if that's possible at any time—but once and for all about the proposed agricultural labour relations bill, because I've also sure heard a lot of false information around over the last several months.

Every step of the process leading up to this legislation has been carried out with the utmost regard for the needs of both farmers and farm workers. We have included members from all affected groups in a rather exhaustive process of planning for the legislation and have found, in spite of some of the comments in this House, remarkable consensus among the participants.

We've taken considerable pains to ensure that the spirit and substance of the recommendations made throughout the process be reflected in the legislation being considered today. So let me take you through, as my role in this debate, the entire process so you can see just how faithful this government has remained to the needs and wishes of those who were involved, and particularly to those of the agricultural community.

Probably, from my background, I would have approached it in a different manner altogether. I found some of the process we've had to go through a little bit cumbersome and a little bit difficult, but there was a recognition that we were dealing with an occupation here that was just a little bit different from the industrial community and workers in industrial establishments in the province of Ontario.

1600

As far back as March 1991 the Minister of Agriculture and Food met with farm groups to express this government's commitment to labour legislation reform. So we started out in that context, letting them know that we certainly had some plans.

In July 1991 senior Ministry of Agriculture and Food staff met with the executive of the labour issues



coordinating committee, a coalition of approximately 36 farm groups and marketing boards.

In the summer of 1991 the Burkett report recommended immediately eliminating the exclusion of industrial or factory methods of farming operations from the collective bargaining process. It did, however, propose further study for the remaining agricultural workforce due to the unique needs of the sector.

In November 1991 my ministry released a discussion paper on labour relations reform. In it we recommended that factory-style methods of production and landscape gardening no longer be excluded from having the right to collective bargaining. If the members in the House here will forgive me, whether they agree or disagree, that small sector was originally what was behind our concern about labour relations reform.

I remember well sitting in this House—I forget the year now, but it's at least 15 years ago—when workers at a mushroom plant—I don't believe it's in operation any more—in Picton signed up better than 70% in an operation that was three shifts, seven days a week, punch-in time cards; it was an industrial operation in every sense of the word. They were denied certification as a trade union, with over 70% signing up, because of their exclusion as agricultural workers. It was a rather rough and sad couple of months we had over that debate at that time in this House some 15 years ago, and it never left me.

That's really what we had been looking at, that there were groups that did have the right to bargain collectively if they were willing themselves to sign up and undertake the obligations that went with being a member of a union.

Farm groups expressed concerns about extending industrial-based labour reforms to the agricultural industry, which has many unique demands. The time sensitivity of harvesting commodities and the constant need for animal care were priority concerns. That's why in January of 1992 I announced the creation of a special joint labour-management task force. It comprised three agricultural industry representatives, three representatives of organized and unorganized labour and one government staff from my ministry and one from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

It's important to note that at the time my intention was to have the task force consider our proposal to extend the Labour Relations Act only to workers in factory-style or industrial methods of agricultural production. That's certainly what was in the background, and the reason for it is exactly what I mentioned a little bit earlier: the debate we went through for several months in this House over the right of a number of workers to organize in what was obviously really an industrial operation and being denied it.

I was also looking for suggestions and alternatives. It was never my intention to bring the family farm under the act. I want you to know that I think I have enough understanding to realize the difficulties we're asking for if that was the approach of the government.

The task force solicited and received comments from many groups: 35 written submissions from groups

ranging from the Canadian Mushroom Growers Association to the Ontario Milk Marketing Board to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. The draft report was submitted to the labour issues coordinating committee, representing 35 agricultural groups, to gain a broad industry consensus before finalizing the report.

Another important point is that the task force considered and rejected three models for extending collective bargaining rights. One would be limited to factory or industrial-type farms; another would be limited to specific commodities; a third would be restricted to operations employing a threshold number of workers. This model, I might say, is used in Quebec and New Brunswick to ensure family farms are not included in labour legislation.

An interesting point here is that it was the agricultural representatives of the task force who most vehemently rejected these models. They saw them as arbitrary and divisive to the agricultural community. Distinctions based on size and number of employees, commodities and so on were seen as unjustifiable.

The task force report was made public on June 26, 1992. The report, I think, was remarkable because it was endorsed by the agricultural community, organized and unorganized labour. It recommended:

- extending the right to collective bargaining to all agricultural workers;

- prohibiting the right to strike or lock out. The task force recognized the sensitive nature of agriculture. Members proposed instead a dispute resolution process that includes negotiation, mediation and, as a last resort, binding arbitration;

- also, creating a separate Labour Relations Act that would reflect the principles of labour reform, as well as the distinctiveness of agriculture.

On August 22, 1992, we announced that we would adopt all of the recommendations of the task force, including developing separate agricultural labour legislation. We also called for a continuation of the task force to recommend parameters of the new legislation.

In November 1992, the Premier reiterated the commitment of the government to separate agricultural labour legislation at a meeting with the Ontario Federation of Agriculture and other farm groups. He stressed that the method of moving forward by consensus among all parties involved was of paramount importance.

Shortly after this, the task force did come to a consensus and submitted its final report to me. It outlined elements of the separate legislation. One of the key recommendations was to establish a management-labour advisory committee to provide ongoing advice on agricultural labour. A second was a provision to place seasonal workers in a separate bargaining unit from year-round employees.

On May 18, 1993, my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and Food and I sent a letter to the task force, telling it we had accepted the recommendations outlined in the second report.

On May 28, 1993, the deputy ministers of both ministries met with the task force to outline the government's decision. They encouraged members to consider the size

and makeup of the proposed labour-management advisory committee, which would provide ongoing advice to the government on agricultural labour relations.

On July 29, 1993, I introduced the agricultural labour relations bill, Bill 91, reflecting the consensus recommendations of the task force. The key elements included:

- Extending the right to organize and bargain collectively to all agricultural employees, regardless of size of operation.

- Excluding seasonal workers until regulations are developed, at which time bargaining units for seasonal workers may be organized. The labour-management committee will be involved in the preparation of these regulations.

- Ensuring that family members cannot be prevented by collective agreements from working on family farms.

- Preventing strikes or lockouts and setting out a structured process for negotiation, mediation and arbitration. Contrary to the opinion of the opposition members, all parties in the process have acknowledged that the legislation does indeed prevent strikes or lockouts.

- Providing for a labour-management committee which will give government ongoing advice regarding reforms and educational programs.

On November 9, 1993, the agricultural groups involved in the labour issues coordinating committee wrote to me outlining their concerns with the wording of the legislation. In it, they also reiterated their commitment to agreements reached by the task force and to the consensus that had developed.

1610

I know that there has been difficulty with the way the legislation has been worded. I understand that this is a sensitive issue for farmers and farm workers. This is why we have spent so much time and effort ensuring that all concerns and options were fully explored before proceeding. Still, we're at an early stage; it's only first reading. I'm able and willing to make appropriate changes before it becomes law to maintain the integrity of the process.

The labour-management advisory committee recommended in the second task force report has been established, the committee we recommended be established. It comprises five representatives each from agriculture and labour. I have been advised that discussions are going well and I hope to receive their recommendations on amendments to the act in the very near future. Once I receive the report, I will be considering changes. I hope to introduce second reading of Bill 91 this sitting, with the appropriate amendments which, with your cooperation, will occur as soon as possible.

I'd like to assure members that our only intention is to have fair, equitable legislation that considers particularly the needs and demands of this most important sector. It's unfortunate—and I say that advisedly—that so much acrimony has arisen regarding this legislation in this House, especially since the industry has been able to reach the consensus it has. Quite frankly, it's much more than I thought was possible when we first started the process between labour and the farm community on this issue.

Clearly, the positives far outnumber and outweigh the negatives in the framing of Bill 91. First and foremost, the cooperation and good faith demonstrated by all sides—farmers, labour organizations, government—are almost unprecedented; certainly in this field it is. The result has been a consensus that should be held as a shining example of what can be achieved when we work with, instead of against, one another.

Second, we're extending the collective bargaining rights to workers in Ontario that have been available—let me reiterate this—that have been available in most other provinces for years: British Columbia since 1976; Quebec since 1964; New Brunswick since 1971; Saskatchewan since the early 1970s. Introducing this legislation is overdue, not overly hasty. I'd like to add that in these other provinces, extending the right to collective bargaining to agricultural workers has not caused unionization of the family farm. A very small percentage of farm workers are currently unionized.

I might add to that just for a moment, because I noticed that the member for Stormont, Dundas, Glengarry and East Grenville refers to “how quickly they want to get rid of Bill 40, if indeed they ever have the opportunity again to form a government.” I would advise him to at least take a look at what's happening at the board and what the first year's progress shows for that legislation, because while it's still not generally accepted by the business community, I am now receiving letters saying that it is cheaper and quicker, with less problems, violence and mistrust in the workplace.

It has not unionized the province of Ontario. There has been a slight increase in it. It has not chased business away from the province of Ontario; it has made it quicker and cheaper and much more effective to deal in labour relations matters. Any government in office has the right to do what it will, but I want to point out that you're sure as blazes, if this is the approach—and I don't mind you taking this approach, because I'd like that information to be out there. There are a heck of a lot of workers in this community, and if workers have something that is now working in the province of Ontario and somebody telling them, “We can't wait to get in power to get rid of that,” I think you might be asking for some trouble. As I said, this has not caused the unionization of the family farm; a very small percentage of farm workers are currently unionized, and I'm talking about the other provinces.

Third, because the government has been so vigilant in accommodating the concerns of the agricultural community, Ontario has taken a fresh and I think rather innovative route. Look at what we have: separate legislation that prohibits the right to strike or lockout, that has strong family member provisions and that provides for an active advisory body on agricultural labour relations. This approach is completely different from the methods other provinces use regarding this particular issue, and I think it's going to turn out to be a better method.

Fourth, rarely has there been as open and responsive a way of approaching an issue as has been employed by my government in this particular field. We've accepted in full the recommendations of the two task force reports. We've encouraged consensus, built good relations



between management and labour and striven for the most equitable solution to the problems. The Premier himself has pledged this government's commitment to consensus.

I ask you to look at the facts. Several meetings have been conducted between myself and/or my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs and the parties involved. There have been countless contacts among representatives of government, farmers and labour organizations during the work of the two task forces as well as during the follow-up periods.

It's unfortunate, and I say this advisedly, that the opposition members of the House have not taken the same pains to understand the entire process. I would like to call on all members to show the same kind of goodwill we've seen in the agricultural and labour communities for more than two years. Set aside some of the more partisan biases and look at the facts. I think you won't have any difficulty in supporting the passage of Bill 91.

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I certainly welcome the opportunity to participate in a debate relating to the very important agrifood industry. It may well be our only debate on this most important sector of our economy this year, as I have noticed it is not on the NDP government's recently leaked priority list. The Tories have never given any real indication of their interest in rural Ontario over these past three years. But with their previous record of regard, or perhaps I should say disregard, for the agrifood industry, that is understandable.

Family farms and the agrifood industry continue to play a vital role in Ontario's economy, a fact fully recognized by the Liberals and evidenced by our leader's motion today. Our record when we were in government is a testament to our commitment to local economies in rural communities right across this province.

We have no regrets about our 52% increase in the Ministry of Ag and Food's budget over the five years when we were in government or for the host of new ag-related programs and initiatives we introduced. We realized the importance of the agrifood industry and took the level of funding from a Tory budget in 1984-85 that had no new funding for agriculture to over \$500 million. That's right, from the Tories at \$328 million when they were in government to over \$500 million in our budget. At the time, 75% of our ministry's budget was direct payments to farmers of \$364 million, more than the Tories' previous budget total.

I'm sure my friends in the Tory caucus cringe when I bring up that budget of 1984-85. As a result of their lack of any new funding at all for agriculture, in an unprecedented move the Ontario Federation of Agriculture called for the resignation of the then Ag and Food minister, Dennis Timbrell, and the Treasurer, Larry Grossman. You know Larry Grossman, the former leader of the Tory party, who while in that position for two years never asked one question about Agriculture and Food.

1620

Now back to this government. When an industry is facing severe pressures like the agriculture industry did during the income crunch of 1991, when crop prices fell

by over 30% and net incomes for the entire industry fell 15%, to levels not seen since 1985, the NDP was no different in its disregard for family farms than the Tories. The NDP responded by delaying its support for GRIP, the gross revenue insurance plan, and NISA, the net income stabilization account program, which cost Ontario farmers \$30 million. They said: "Wait. Wait for the Hayes task force report on farm finance." Or remember the agriculture investment strategy announcement of 1992, which really has never materialized. The \$120 million for farmers disappeared under the NDP government's self-inflicted spiralling deficit problems.

Worse than the last Tory budget, let the record show this NDP government reduced ag and food spending by \$49 million in their last budget, an 8% reduction. How can the NDP government justify this when overall government spending has increased 15% and some of their favourite ideological ministries, like Labour, have increased 13%, or Citizenship, which has increased 58%?

Now Bob Rae, in his desire to gain favour with rural Ontario, has renamed the Ministry of Agriculture and Food to include the words "and rural development." Unfortunately, though, no new moneys were added with these imaginary responsibilities, so that the plight of the agrifood industry is even further dissipated. In fact, the NDP government will spend more money to replace all the signs on buildings and vehicles and to change their letterhead than they will on new programs for agriculture.

These aren't the ways you help an industry facing ever-increasing global competition. You don't help any industry by shutting down its research and technology facilities, its places of higher learning, its windows to the future, like the NDP did at New Liskeard and Centralia. You don't ask an industry to be more environmentally sound and then cut the land stewardship program and enact legislation that allows for megadumps on good agricultural land. You don't say you're committed to farming and cut off funding to the Farm Start program. You don't show your support to livestock producers by axing the Red Meat II program and then sell off the Ontario stock yards and take all the producers' money and put it into consolidated revenues, only to be eaten up by the deficit.

The NDP's overall strategy for Ontario is to let the Toronto tail wag the Ontario dog. Every piece of legislation and those mountains of regulations you secretly decree affect rural communities and family farms, yet you fail to realize this even when it is brought directly to your attention.

Last fall when I sat on the committee studying Bill 79, the Employment Equity Act, I put forward an amendment that would give farmers an exemption for the seasonal offshore labour they use. The government members failed to even comprehend the situation, especially in the Georgian Bay area, where over 800 such workers are sent to them through a federal arrangement. They failed to realize the apple grower has no say in who is sent.

After the committee, I spoke to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, who seemed totally unaware of these ramifications. His response was: "I think we will do something in the regulations. Speak to my PA, Paul

Klopp. I think he's handling that." When I took the opportunity the next day to speak to the member for Huron, his response was much the same. "Oh, yes. I think we will do something in the regulations to cover that." Well, Bill 79 came and went, and to this day I have yet to see the regulations that will protect the farmers.

This is so typical of the NDP government. They don't understand rural Ontario and, quite frankly, I don't think they care. Their ideological bent on issues, especially employment issues, precludes the family farm and rural communities. Their only answer seems to be to hide it in regulations that never materialize.

Which brings me to this bill, Bill 91, the NDP government's failed attempt to recognize realities in the agricultural labour market. Should the Minister of Labour have consulted with the Minister of Agriculture, Food and rural development or, even better, if the Minister of Agriculture, Food and rural development had told the Minister of Labour of the structure of the agricultural labour market, together with the sensitivities of the sector such as perishability, animal welfare, low incomes and global competition, he would know that agriculture deserves, and in fact cries out for, differential treatment in the labour relations context. Is anybody in your government talking to each other? Is there anyone at the cabinet table for rural Ontario?

But the Minister of Labour didn't even have to talk to his colleagues, which I assume he didn't. All he had to do was read the two reports and the background studies prepared by his Agricultural Labour Relations Task Force. There is no evidence that he has done that. However, the public is becoming far too familiar with these NDP tactics of co-opting the stakeholders by pretending to consult and then just slamming down legislation which only reflects its own ideological bent. If the stakeholders cry foul, just tell them you will cover it in the regulations, and throughout the process hold the ever-threatening government stick over their heads while doing so.

I am telling you, you just can't do that with the province's second-leading industry. They'll revolt in the streets, and in fact I think we have seen signs of that already.

The realities are that the ongoing structural change in Ontario agriculture has had a profound impact on rural Ontario. The rationalization of agriculture, which can be attributed to a wide number of factors, including high real interest rates in the 1980s, low commodity prices, increasing input costs, trade issues and falling market share, has affected the economic and social fabric of many rural communities. Your attempts to unionize the family farm only further erode the social fabric in rural Ontario and are in direct conflict with the farmers I talk with.

As I've said before, and despite these current trends, Ontario still has the largest and most diversified agricultural industry in Canada. Ontario is the largest crop-producing province, based on cash receipts, and it is the second-largest producer of livestock and livestock products. This doesn't mean the NDP government can sink its teeth into these industries and extract the union

dues. The farmers cannot bear the added burden of union costs, and the consumer won't tolerate any price increases.

The vast majority of farms employ fewer than five employees. A substantial portion of these employees are seasonal. The seasonality of employment in agriculture, as well as the prominence of casual and offshore labour, suggests that the composition of the appropriate agricultural bargaining unit is a significant one, not something that should be dealt with later in the regulations, as this bill would suggest.

Nor should these family farms be expected to battle giant union organization drives put on by the United Food and Commercial Workers, who have far more resources and money. It would really be the giant union swallowing the tiny family farm.

But perhaps the most significant thing about this piece of legislation is not what is in it, but what isn't in it. Here I am referring to a comprehensive and flexible definition of "agriculture."

The absence of a definition of agriculture may go to the very root of the problem. It clearly underlines the NDP government's inability to come to grips with the realities facing family farms, and highlights its lack of understanding of agriculture.

The current absence of a definition in the Labour Relations Act has left the board, and indeed the courts, to struggle with the meaning. As agricultural enterprises have become more specialized and more profoundly affected by technological advances, the board has found it more difficult to know whether or not, for labour relation purposes, a certain activity is agriculture. It can be anticipated that these difficulties will still arise with the absence of a definition for agriculture.

If you need guidance in defining the term, you could look to the state of California, where "agriculture" is an inclusive term meant to embrace all agricultural and horticultural operations, as well as practices that are performed as part of a farming operation. In Massachusetts, agriculture is defined to include "horticulture, floriculture and any other commercial enterprise involving the production of food or fibre."

1630

Better yet, you could ask the advice of the task force that you set up to study agricultural labour relations and take its definition.

Still better, you could learn from those legislators who established the Ontario Labour Relations Act, when, I might add, agriculture was the leading industry in this province, and who, in their wisdom, exempted agriculture.

But my best advice to you, Minister, is to take this bill and go out to the family farm: a farm that consists of fathers and sons, of brothers and brothers-in-law, of mothers and daughters, of sisters and sisters-in-law, of nieces and nephews and of first and second cousins, maybe. The Dowlings on Howe Island, who rent some of our farm land, come to mind. Go out there and learn what it means to live and work on a family farm, to face droughts, to see a piece of your crop or commodity fall



to new lows because of foreign pressures. Stand there with the family members and watch your crop rot in the fields because it costs you more to take it out than you would recover from its sale. Sit in the living room and watch as trade deals and international agreements erode your ever-shrinking income. Stand there and watch as your machinery breaks down and your buildings collapse, knowing the banker won't lend you the money to keep abreast of technological advances or even stay afloat. Yes, leave the city of Toronto, go out to rural communities, listen to family farmers, and then, Mr Minister, then come back and try to tell us you want to unionize the family farm.

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe a quorum is present.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I'll find out. Is a quorum present?

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex McFedries):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals:** A quorum is now present.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** I'm pleased to join the discussion today regarding Bill 91 and I certainly support the comments that have been made by the critic for our party. I would indicate also that there was no demonstrated need for Bill 91, ever, in this province. There wasn't an outcry from people in the agricultural community demanding that this legislation be implemented. It's part of the government's attempt to unionize as many people as possible in the province in response to a special-interest group: the unions.

Unfortunately, Bill 91 does not honour the commitment the government made to the agricultural community, and I can assure you that at present there is a high degree of anxiety in rural Ontario concerning Bill 91. This bill is fundamentally flawed, and some of the major farm groups have expressed grave concerns about the bill. It fails totally to recognize that agriculture is a unique industry by nature and that a very special status is required in order to maintain the productivity and quality levels this province has established.

I heard the Minister of Labour refer to the fact that there had been extensive consultation, that there had been a process developed, but I just want to say that I have heard the story before: I heard it in the case of Bill 40. There was supposedly extensive consultation with all the groups, all the partners. However, when the government went to put the legislation on paper, the only words, the only responses the government seems to hear are those consistent with its own viewpoint, and that's unfortunately the case here.

I was pleased, however, to hear the minister say he is willing to take another look, and I hope that as a result of the debate today he will make changes to Bill 91 which reflect the genuine concerns of the agricultural community in this province.

I want to quote from a letter the minister received on November 9, 1993, from Grant Smith, the chair of the

labour issues coordinating committee, who indicates in this letter that, "The Labour Issues Coordinating Committee was extremely disappointed to find that Bill 91 failed to translate into statutory form the consensus developed by the Agricultural Labour Relations Task Force on a number of critical points."

I want to proceed further and deal with the issues that were not adequately addressed in the first draft of the bill and that have certainly generated this high level of anxiety and concern in the province.

This document states, "The Minister of Labour recognized the significance of the task force's accomplishments by confirming in writing on May 19, 1993, that the government would 'proceed with a separate Labour Relations Act for the agricultural sector which will be based on the task force recommendations.'" However, this document then states, "Careful review of the proposed Agricultural Labour Relations Act, 1993, however, leads to the conclusion that the legislative drafters have not succeeded in this task."

That is the reason for much of the concern, the fact that the legal interpretation indicates that this is indeed not what has happened.

"The agricultural community believes that the consensual balance between labour relations and agrarian principles found in the task force recommendations has simply not found its way into legislative form. Instead, the legislative drafters, at almost every turn, have favoured general labour relations principles at the expense of the agricultural context."

I think that is the key area of concern, the fact that they favour labour relations principles at the expense of the agricultural context.

It goes on to say, "In so doing, the extension of collective bargaining has been achieved without the corresponding recognition of the uniqueness of the agricultural sector. It is this failure of the legislative drafters to capture the consensual balancing of principles that forms the subject matter of this submission."

They go on to talk about the deficiencies in the draft legislation. They talk about:

—"(a) The failure to create a sufficiently separate statutory framework," that is, a distinct, free-standing agricultural labour relations act which gives expression and emphasis to the unique nature of agriculture. Presently, as the bill is written, the Labour Relations Act is made to apply to agriculture except as expressly modified by the bill. That is probably one of the most serious concerns with the legislation, the fact that there is not a distinct agricultural labour relations act and that there is no recognition of the uniqueness of the agricultural community.

—"(b) The failure to create a...separate administrative body," for example, an agriculture labour relations board.

—"(c) The failure to emphasize sufficiently in the preamble the unique nature of the agricultural sector," that is, to balance the extension of collective bargaining with responsiveness to the unique nature of the agricultural sector.

For example, there was absolutely no responsiveness to

the unique nature, the fact that you have to consider seasonality, you have to consider the climate, the time, the perishability of the produce. None of this was taken into consideration as they drafted the preamble. That had been something that had been supported by the task force and that it hoped would be included, but nowhere was that incorporated.

1640

—“(d) The failure to define agriculture” at all, whatsoever.

—“(e) The failure to provide adequate enforcement provisions to the prohibition on strikes.” This issue, as you can well imagine, is of overwhelming concern to the agricultural community, since any work stoppage could be catastrophic, and any decision that had been made to extend collective bargaining rights to agricultural employees was always based on the impression by the farming community that there would be an absolute restriction on the right to strikes or lockouts. Unfortunately, Bill 91 does not, in its present form, provide the adequate enforcement provisions to the prohibition on strikes, and so that is totally lacking and certainly needs to be addressed by the government.

—“(f) The failure to give full effect to the parties’ wish for a dispute resolution system of final offer selection.” I think you can see that this bill just simply does not recognize the unique nature of the agricultural sector. It’s very much based upon the labour negotiations, the labour act.

—“(g) The failure to implement task force recommendations” which were “designed to provide specialized services, educate and give initial support to the affected parties.” The bill is lacking what was recommended by the task force. The task force had recommended that there be a labour-management advisory committee established, that there be mediation and selection services, that there be a pay research board and joint education and training. Unfortunately, that’s not included within the context of the bill, and so, although they are achieving the government’s objective of extending collective bargaining to the agricultural sector, and of course this is a new idea, they are not providing within the bill the necessary infrastructure that is consistent with the recommendations of the task force that are going to ensure the proper working of this new labour relations system. So again, the government did not respond and did not listen to the task force, and so again this is an area that the government needs to take a look at.

They need to take a look at the fact that there was “(h) Inadequate treatment of family members.” There are a number of flaws contained in the drafting of the bill, with the result that the concerns of the farm employers regarding family members have not been properly addressed. Again, the minister needs to take a look at making the appropriate changes so that the farming community does feel comfortable with the treatment of family members.

There’s also “(i) Inadequate exclusion of seasonal workers.” Again, what was discussed was not translated into the bill.

There is “(j) Inadequate presumption for the exclusion of share growers,” and there are “(k) Inadequate provisions regarding access to farm property for organizing purposes.”

These are the concerns that have been expressed that the minister needs to take a look at. This document goes on to state, “One final introductory remark concerning the bill”—Bill 91—“is warranted.” It says, “Together, government, trade union, employer and farm worker forged an unprecedented consensus on labour reform in Ontario through their representatives on the task force,” a task force which, by the way, has worked very diligently in trying to arrive at that unprecedented consensus.

But then the document goes on to say: “Yet, when it came time to reduce the recommendations of the task force to legislation, the government chose to depart from the approach of the task force by introducing a bill without prior consultation or opportunity for review by the parties. Indeed, in the case of the employer community, an express offer to participate in the drafting process” of the bill “was rejected by the government. To the extent acrimony replaces consensus building in the days and weeks ahead, it will be a direct result of the government’s own failure to follow this process to its logical conclusion by seeking the consensus of the parties on the language necessary to implement the task force recommendations.”

So I guess it’s fine for the minister to talk about the extensive consultation that has taken place, the process that was used. However, there is certainly proof within the document I have been reading from that in the final stage of the process, these participants were not invited to participate in the process to draft the bill. I think that’s extremely unfortunate, and that is what has created the very uncertain climate within the province.

I would just like to say that, just as our party is opposed to Bill 40—and I think we need to repeat again that Bill 40 has caused tremendous financial hardship in this province. It certainly has contributed to a loss of jobs. People are not investing in the province as they may have intended to do simply because they are concerned about the replacement worker section and they are concerned about the facility of unionization, the fact that employees just don’t have that sober second thought any more. Just as we would be prepared to repeal Bill 40 and we would be prepared to introduce secret ballots for all employees, we would certainly, if elected, also be in a position where we would repeal Bill 91, because at the present time we do not feel it adequately responds to the needs of the farming community in this province. In fact, it has created a great deal of hostility, distrust and anxiety.

I hope the minister will listen to the presentations that have been made today. I hope that he will make every attempt to continue with the process, as he has indicated he wants to, because we certainly need to be responsive to these very, very genuine concerns that have been expressed.

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** In all of these discussions I think there are some catchphrases that have been bandied about, and we should take a really good look at them.



One of them is talking about the "family farm." When we do talk about the family farm, I think we have to get a good picture of what the family farm is. I don't think you'll find many family farms hiring a lot of people. You may find one or two hired hands, but generally it's the family members on a family farm who work together to produce the crops.

There are some family farms that have families who join their farms together and might have an uncle or a couple of brothers joining together and working the family farm, but again I think you'll find the workers are made up of those members of the family who still support the family farm in those areas.

I think it's important to remember that when we talk about family farms, especially when we talk about unionizing family farms. That's simply not the case. We're not unionizing family farms. We are offering an opportunity for those plant locations such as cheese processors and mushroom factories and chicken processing plants, the plant idea in the agriculture sector, the opportunity to be unionized should they desire that, should they want that. That is the way a union works.

So when one of my colleagues mentioned the giant union organization swallowing up the family farm, the joke was you would think you'd see this bus of giant union people rolling into town to organize and unionize the poor, small family farm. That's just not the case.

In fact, I think you'll find in a union situation where you are organizing, it's not a matter of a large conglomerate coming in and unionizing a plant. It is the plant workers who go to a union and who say, "We need to be organized." It's about health and safety regulations. It's about a procedure that gives me fair treatment in this plant, be it a chicken plant, be it a cheese processing plant, be it a mushroom plant, be it General Motors, be it any type of union plant that is organized. It's the workers who come forward and say: "For these reasons, we're asking you how we form a union for our protection. How do we do that?"

1650

I simply cannot see three brothers coming to the union and saying, "We need to be organized against our father here, who's not giving us fair and equal treatment." It's just not the way it is. It's not about that.

We've heard a lot about some of the points of this legislation that need work. There are things in here that are not what members of the opposition would like to see in legislation, but it is a process where we have seen a consensus come together on the task force and put forward points on what they wanted to see in this typical legislation. So even though there are some pieces here that are not perfect, I think we are seeing an ongoing effort on behalf of the task force members, on behalf of government members on the committee, on behalf of people who have come together to say there are things we need to address in this legislation and we're continuing to work those out. That's what a consensus is. I feel very good that there is a consensus out there that says this is the type of legislation we need.

We do understand the agricultural sector is a unique

sector and it does require certain elements in legislation to address the concerns of the community around the harvesting of a crop, around the spoilage of a harvest that comes in that cannot sit, around some of those concerns about the strike situation. So we are looking at working these things out.

If we had brought in the perfect piece of legislation, there will always be one or two out there who say, "This is not what I want to see." In fact, there will always be this other side of the House. No matter how perfect that legislation is, there will always be people there who say, "This isn't what we want." That's what second reading is all about and that's what making amendments to this legislation is going to be able to do. It's going to be able to address the concerns that the community may or may not have, that the task force may or may not have, that members may or may not have. We're going to be able to say, "Okay, fine, if there's a problem here, that's what we're doing in first and second reading." We're looking at some of those concerns and we may bring in some amendments to address those concerns, but those amendments are coming again from a consensus and from a task force made up of various people in the community and those in the community include some very expert people from the agricultural sector.

I want to go into the legislation now. I was reading over the orders of the day, and this is opposition day, and they have a lot of "whereases" and I thought it was very interesting to take a look at the "whereases." In the first place, it says, "Whereas in the past family farming operations have been exempted from the provisions of the Ontario Labour Relations Act in order to minimize the impact of disruptive labour..." That's exactly what we're doing. We are putting aside the agriculture sector and we are looking at a unique sector out there and we are looking at exemptions from the Ontario Labour Relations Act. We are looking at special cases and specific clauses in a separate situation so we can address those concerns in the agriculture sector.

So where they say whereas they have been exempted, which would be devastating to many farm operations, we are listening to that. So there's a "whereas" we're already dealing with; we're already looking at the bargaining rights of legislation. As the Minister of Labour has indicated, there is bargaining rights legislation available in most other provinces. This is not unique legislation we're bringing in. Where the agriculture sector is unique we're addressing those concerns. But in British Columbia, since 1975 there have been bargaining rights in this sector, in Quebec since 1964, in New Brunswick since 1971, and in Saskatchewan since the early 1970s. We are well aware that we are bringing in a piece of legislation that is not new and we are well aware of the exemptions that are necessary.

In the second one it says, "Whereas under Bill 40 the NDP government removed the Ontario Labour Relations Act exemption for farming operations, promising to enact separate farm legislation." Yes, that's what we're doing. The "whereas" says, "Because you said this." Gee, that's what we're doing. We're bringing in some special clauses and some special legislation around it. There is separate

farm legislation under Bill 91 and there are continuing endeavours to pass this special legislation. Again, we are working at that.

I love the next "whereas." The next "whereas" tells us something we already know: Whereas the government created the labour relations task force and whereas it's made up of farm employers and two representatives—that's certainly good verbiage. I think we're all kind of used to that from the Liberals. They're good at verbiage, they really are. We are looking at the task force recommendations in the agricultural labour legislation, if it's introduced, and this is, as I said, ongoing.

The next "whereas" is very interesting. It says "such as ensuring that immediate relatives of farm owners are not forced to join unions." Nobody is forced to join unions, not family members or relatives of farm owners. There is nothing in this legislation that will force their family members to join unions, and especially on family farms, where you find most of the workers are going to be family members, you're just not going to have it.

I've worked with some union people and they have told me that the best organizer for a union is a poor employer. Even looking at mushroom factories, even looking at cheese processing plants, even looking at chicken processing plants, if the workers in those plants are being taken care of, have adequate benefits, have an adequate pay scale, have health and safety regulations, feel they are part of that organization, they are not going to call, they are not going to ask someone to come and unionize them. They would not give up a good working relationship with their owners or with the people in the plant if they didn't feel they had something to gain. So, as I said, the best organizer for a union is a poor employer.

I must tell you, they're so concerned they said even two and three people can be unionized. Unions don't want to organize three people. They're not going to come down and organize three people on a farm. If the three people come and say, "Please organize it," fine, they'll come down, they'll take a look and they'll do it. But this picture that the unions are going to be going through the countryside looking for people to organize on family farms is just not the case. It's not the case. It's not worth their while. It's not worth the dues. It's not worth the hassle. It's not worth it for them to go and organize three people on a family farm. It just isn't so.

I know that because I've dealt with a union organizer, if that's what you want to call him, a union rep. I've dealt with a union rep and a union organizer for something like 30 years and I just know that it's not worth their time, it's not worth their effort, unless they're asked to come in. They don't go out looking for it. They don't have the time. They don't have the—

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** They're hiding at every farm gate.

**Mrs Haslam:** Oh, they are. That's the whole process. They seem to think that there they're going to be, they're going to jump out at the gate and say, "Buddy, you wanna sign a union card?" It just isn't going to happen. It just isn't going to be there.

One of the other things is that in the next it says, "Whereas the NDP government's agriculture labour legislation, Bill 91, fails to protect family farming operations from labour disruptions." That's not true. I think the Minister of Labour in this particular instance has been very clear, saying, "Set out a structured process for negotiation, mediation, arbitration. Contrary to the opinion of the opposition members, all parties in the process"—he's talking about the process of coming to a consensus around this legislation—"have acknowledged that the legislation does indeed prevent strikes or lockouts."

That's been very clear in this: It prevents strikes and it prevents lockouts. When they're talking about "fails to protect family farming operations from labour disruptions," that is not accurate. The legislation has been very clear, and the parties, the members of the committee, the task force, who have been looking at this legislation have acknowledged very, very plainly that the legislation does indeed prevent strikes or lockouts.

1700

The next one is: "Whereas agriculture organizations across the province are calling for massive amendments or a total rewrite of the legislation, which the Minister of Labour refuses to consider." Again, not true. I just met with my local Perth federation of agriculture on Saturday. We have an annual meeting where we get together and we talk about issues. They are very complimentary of this government. They are very complimentary about the issues and about the attention that has been given to the farm community, to the rural community, attention they have not had previously.

They are very, very impressed with the way this Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs is dealing with the community. The minister has been into my riding on numerous occasions. He has sat around kitchen tables in my county and spoken with the commodity representatives and ordinary people. He has come and sat around a kitchen table and talked about rural issues, to take those issues they have and to come back and to do something. They were very quick to say, "We're very pleased, Karen, about the attention and about what your government is doing."

Even the ethanol plant. It was the first time that finally somebody paid attention to what they've been saying, and it was this government that's put the guarantee in there for that ethanol plant in the riding. It is this government that is putting forth and leading in the ethanol industry. They're very, very pleased and very, very supportive.

They also are very supportive of this legislation, very supportive of the labour-management advisory committee that's been set up. We have some members in my riding who are very in tune and at the forefront of things that are going on in the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. They are very supportive of the labour-management advisory committee and the people who serve on that.

They don't want us to listen to a few disgruntled right-wing people out there. They are there in my riding, and the federation representatives at this meeting were saying, "We've got to work together to tell the people out there what this is all about." It's not the rhetoric of a few. It's



not the national coalition; it's not the Ontarians for Responsible Government. This is the group that doesn't like supply management, if I'm not mistaken; the national coalition wouldn't support supply management. It just blows my mind. They suddenly found another issue. I don't think the people who have joined them in this fight have really looked into their policies. I have. I have looked into their policies. Their policies are not supply management, their policies are not support for agriculture and their policies are not support for the farm community. They are very right-wing. They are very free-market concepts.

My OFA in my riding realizes this and is very clear to me in saying: "They don't speak for the majority in your riding, Karen. They don't speak for us. They don't speak for the farmers in this community. They are a few disgruntled loudmouths. They don't speak for us." What they're saying to me is: "We want this legislation, Karen. Where is it? Where is this legislation? We want it and we want it brought in now. Could you please take that message back?" I did and I am. They want this legislation.

In particular, I would like to mention Kelly Crowley who wrote a letter to the editor of the *Beacon* in Stratford and came out very strongly for this legislation. She's a farm wife. She's in the pork with her husband. She's in the pork congress and represents the commodity group on the federation meetings that we have. She came out and said, "This is about fairness and equity for the workers on our farms and in our processing plants."

The farm community is very much in favour of what we're doing in this legislation. I wanted to mention that, when they talk about rewriting it. No, they don't want this legislation withdrawn; they don't want it rewritten. There are some concerns the task force is working on, and that's fine, but they want this in, and they want it in very quickly.

They say, "Whereas farming operations are particularly sensitive to labour disruptions because of spoilage of crops and the health of animals." Yes, that's true. The agriculture sector has to be concerned about that, and yes, it's already being addressed. For instance, again from the Minister of Labour, he said: "Look at what we have: separate legislation that prohibits the right to strike or lockout, that has strong family-member provisions and that provides for an active advisory body on agricultural labour relations. This approach is completely different from the methods other provinces use regarding this issue."

Again, we recognize the uniqueness of the agriculture sector, we have addressed its concerns, we do recognize its concerns about the labour disruptions because of the uniqueness of the agriculture sector and we are looking at that. That's what we're doing: We're putting that in place in separate legislation, in this separate piece, so that they do have that. It will be part of the same act, with a uniqueness that is addressed in what we're doing in Bill 91. If they wanted to look at something else, we're listening, we're talking to them. That's what I'm trying to say: It's not a given. This is an ongoing process that both the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs

and the Minister of Labour have indicated they're working on.

We have legislation. Yes, as I said, there may be some further changes; the ministers might come forward with some changes. But it's not an unusual process here in this place to do that. It's not a call to totally take the legislation away and rewrite it. If this were a Liberal government, they'd say, "Okay, fine, we'll take it away, we'll rewrite it, and maybe it'll be ready in the fall, but we're not sure, and maybe it'll be ready in our second session, but we're not sure." That's what's been done time after time after time for the people in the agricultural community. They said, "We'll look at it and maybe we'll bring it in," but that has not happened. This is a government that is bringing something in. We want to address their concerns now, and we're willing to work with them to do that.

I think lots happened between the readings of the legislation. We have an ongoing labour-management advisory committee that's working, we have ongoing cooperation with this task force, and consultation. I firmly believe that a consensus is important to ensure that the unique characteristics of the agriculture industry can continue to be accommodated through the separate labour relations framework of Bill 91.

**Mr Cleary:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I think this is very important, and we should have a quorum in the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Would the clerk determine whether there's a quorum present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Perth may proceed.

**Mrs Haslam:** I agree: It's a very important issue, and I believe a quorum should be present. I'm pleased to see that there is one here. I think the interest in the agriculture sector and in its uniqueness in this legislation has to be heard. I firmly believe that a consensus is important to ensure that the unique characteristics of the agriculture industry can continue to be accommodated through the separate labour relations framework of Bill 91, particularly special provisions like the prohibiting of the right to strike by arbitration and the seniority for family members. These are things that have to be addressed, and we are addressing them.

I think concerns of farmers are being heard and they are being addressed. As a result, we will be bringing in legislation that will have a broad base of support in our communities. I look forward to the introduction of the second reading of this legislation so we can see it come forward and become law very quickly in this spring session, because that's what the farming community in my riding and the farming community out there is working with us for: the bringing forth of Bill 91 to conclusion.

1710

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I will be characteristically brief and to the point on this. The farm community needs a lot of things done to assist in recovering some of the activities that used to go on there. We've had, as the member for Northumberland so rightly identified, the cutback in so many areas in our agricultural services that we need to be looking at how we can help them recover the vitality that was once the hallmark in rural Ontario—not the least of which activities are those that used to be carried on by the old Ministry of Agriculture and Food. It's now called the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, but what you do with a name doesn't change the style of government.

While the Minister of Agriculture is here, it's interesting to read the release of March 29, wherein Brant county and the regional municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth will now share a single office, where there used to be two offices dealing with the farm populations in those two very important rural areas in Ontario.

Basically, here's the bottom line: "No matter what you think of us, you can always reach us by telephone." That's really the only service the Ministry of Ag and Food will soon offer to rural Ontario, if we're not careful. The Minister of Agriculture and Food is held in very high regard. In fact, it's probably the one thing I would be able to agree with, without looking more closely, in the speech by the member for Perth. Mr Buchanan is indeed held in high regard, because he has a very good ear and he has put a lot of effort into doing a lot of work in rural Ontario, and he's to be congratulated for that. I would have to say, mind you, that he has had a couple of notable failings. One notable failing is retaining a high level of personal service to rural Ontario.

The service that was provided by the OMAF offices is not provided any more like it used to be. For instance, I saw an interesting publication that indicated that while Quebec may have some 14 assistants looking after the pork industry in that province, we end up with two, one less than a couple of the maritime provinces, who look after pork industry consultation in our province. I'm concerned by that, because that type of trend has been heightened and increased currently under this particular administration.

The run-down of our agricultural colleges, the depletion of the facilities that are available to train young people in the art and science of farm business, in the art and science of dealing with new products, use of chemicals and herbicides and other things, is, I think, regrettable. That doesn't happen to agree with some of the provisions put forward by an organization like the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario, for instance, but it is my view that every time you take away a facility, as there have been facilities eliminated in this province, you will end up fulfilling the prophesy that there is less and less worthwhile attention to be spent in rural Ontario. I think that's regrettable.

In the end, what really is condemning is that the Minister of Agriculture lost this round with respect to this labour bill. There was a very clear understanding, an

undertaking given during the debate on Bill 40, that there would be a separate piece of legislation which would not come under the aegis of the Minister of Labour, that it would in fact come under the aegis of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, as he was then known. In fact, I think the deal was struck because there was a sense that the Minister of Agriculture and Food, Elmer Buchanan, would deliver on that commitment and promise. I don't think the farm community would have agreed to that without something in very strong terms being written on paper, unless it had been Elmer who was making the offer.

In this regard, Mr Buchanan has a second failing in his dealing with rural Ontario. His inability to wrest this provision away from a very paternalistic Minister of Labour means very much that there is nothing unique about agriculture or agricultural labour in the province of Ontario. That is his chief and second failing in regard to his mandate.

I haven't really got any more time left, but I just want to indicate this: The two principal provisions that have been brought forward for agriculture at this particular time, the stable funding and the agricultural labour relations bill, have done nothing to solidify the vitality of rural Ontario.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Elston:** In fact, I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that if the member for Oxford would go back to sleep like he normally is in this place, I could finish my speech. And you know something? The member for Oxford for ever sits in his seat and chirps and chirps and he doesn't have the courage to stand up and deliver a speech ever. He doesn't have the time of day to speak out for his constituents, but he can sit in his seat and try and bother everybody else who speaks.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. Would members come to order.

**Mr Elston:** I'm going to stop here, because I have wakened the people on the perches over there who don't have courage to stand up and speak out for their own constituents. All they have time to do is bicker and push their own dissension on the chamber's decorum. I wish that you would speak out once in a while in a meaningful way, member for Oxford, and then maybe we could get at you the way you seem to like to get at other people who represent their constituents.

I want to say one more thing before I leave this, and I've gone slightly over the time that I had been allotted. That is this: The member for Perth had indicated several things, one I agreed with, and that is that Elmer's held in high regard, and a couple of things I did not agree with. The other thing is the fact that this labour legislation will have really very little impact on farm stability or on the stability of our economy in rural Ontario.

**Mrs Haslam:** No, I didn't say that.

**Mr Elston:** The member for Perth now retracts what I believe she said. She is now admitting to us that this will not help rural economic stability whatsoever.

**Mrs Haslam:** No, I don't admit that either. That's



incorrect. You are good at incorrections today, Murray.

**Mr Elston:** That's what my point is with respect to Bill 91. This is not a good piece of legislation for rural Ontario, this will not help us secure the future of rural Ontario and in the end it will mean less work for fewer people in rural Ontario at a time when we need more work in the province of Ontario. That is what condemns this piece of legislation to failure.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** It's my pleasure to have a few minutes to comment on this opposition resolution by the Liberal Party. I want to first of all recognize Noble Villeneuve, our critic for Agriculture, and Elizabeth Witmer, our Labour critic, for the excellent presentations they put forward on behalf of the people of Ontario and on behalf of the farm organizations in particular.

I was kind of shocked to hear the Minister of Labour say that he still remembers a mushroom plant around Picton, I believe he said, where 70% of the members had joined up and wanted to organize and they couldn't because they came under the Department of Agriculture. That being still with him, he's getting some personal satisfaction out of being able to bring in this very, very strong labour legislation which is going to be applied now not only to mushroom factories and other industrialized types of processing plants but right across the whole agricultural sector.

For the minister and the member for Perth to stand up and say, "Oh, it's not going to affect the family farm," is not acceptable, and I'm surprised at the Minister of Agriculture sitting down and listening to that, because he knows very well this is just the opening of the gates. This is just the start. Naturally you're going to hit where the largest membership is and you're going to organize there, but it's also going to continue. As the member for Perth stated, "There's wonderful protection in here for the family farm." Why do we need protection if it's not going to happen there?

**Mr Sutherland:** No one believes in the domino theory any more.

1720

**Mr Jordan:** You say, "We're not going out to organize two or three people." Yes, you are going out to organize two or three people. You just finished it in Orangeville at McDonald's. You started out with two or three people, but what was your objective? Your long-range objective was to organize the agricultural industry. You're not fooling the farmers in my riding by thinking that you're just coming in here to talk about the industrialized units in agriculture. You are talking about organizing agriculture across this province.

I can say to you today, with the Ontario farmers facing the new global marketing prospects that are out there and having to adjust to the new milk marketing board, that we were quite unsuccessful in convincing the federal governments to maintain article XI intact. So now we're out trying to bring to the farmers another cumbersome piece of legislation that's really the beginning of the end.

I know what the family farm is going to do. They're

going to throw up their hands and say, "Take it." The larger farm—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Jordan:** Yes, they are, I say to the member for Perth, because I've got farms already in my riding that used to have maybe 30 or 60 dairy cows, and some of them have increased to as large as 400. Don't tell me you're not going to organize that dairy farm, because you are.

**Mrs Haslam:** Not unless they want to be.

**Mr Jordan:** What are you doing with small business out there? Small business is being shut down because you abolished the word "helper." You can't have a helper on the job any more. He or she has to be either an apprentice or a journeyman, and they have to carry that card to show that.

We've got plumbers, electricians and many of the 17 trades that are affected by this legislation under Bill 40 coming to my constituency office wondering how they're going to continue to operate as a small business, because the owner of the business never did have a journeyman's licence, and he may have an apprentice working with him, but the other man or person was known as a helper. Now, unless that helper becomes an apprentice, the job is shut down. You are paying the inspector to go around and close that job down.

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** This is an old argument. This was the same argument they used in 1930. It doesn't work any more.

**Mr Jordan:** I'm just telling you. You say it couldn't happen there a year ago. It is happening, and it's going to happen in agriculture.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Do we have to put up with this?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. Could I speak for a moment? I'd ask the members to come to order, and would the member please direct his comments to the Chair. Thank you. Go ahead.

**Mr Jordan:** I would like to say that had this legislation been brought in, as originally planned, under the Minister of Agriculture, I know the people in my riding would have been much more comfortable and more readily in the mood to accept a form of labour legislation relative to their agricultural operation. But now it's being brought in by the Minister of Labour, who told us just a few minutes ago that he goes out on occasion to visit his younger brother to try and get a little bit of direction and keep his feet on the ground as to what is required there for a beef operation or a dairy operation or whatever.

Hopefully, he will get some direction from actual visits to the farm and realize that the labour organization as structured here under this Bill 91 is not suitable and not acceptable to the farmers in the province of Ontario. I speak especially about the farmers in my riding. They are very, very concerned about it, because they can see it as just the beginning of what is going to be a very difficult piece of legislation for them to be able to operate under.

The minimum wage is already affecting them, because when the students used to come to work as summer help on the farm, the farmer would probably pay them \$50 a day, but that included their board, it included transporta-

tion, and it included clothing in lots of cases. Now, with the increased dollar costs, they can't pay \$70 a day; they're better to leave the crop in the field.

I think you have to take all those things into consideration when you start introducing legislation such as this. Show me one sector of the farm operation, whether it was processing or whatever, that came to this government, wrote a letter or asked for labour legislation to be introduced in order that they could run their business and be more efficient and operate their farm and be more competitive in this global market. I don't know of one case—I know there isn't one in my riding—that ever wrote a letter, even to the Minister of Agriculture who they do have a lot of faith in, and asked him to bring in legislation that would organize their family farms.

It's very regrettable—the Minister is holding up a piece of paper. Maybe he'd pass it over so that we could learn something we haven't seen.

What concerns me is that the Minister of Labour, more so than the Minister of Agriculture, is saying, "We're out consulting, and we're asking the people and they're telling us this." The member for Perth has stated that she has met with her agricultural people and they say: "Hurry up with this legislation. Who's holding it up? We need it. We want it." I don't know if "we" is two people or herself and one other person, but certainly there are no people in my riding who are asking me to ask the ministers to hurry along with this proposed legislation.

If you continue to say to the people of this province, "I'm consulting you and I'm listening and I'm going to implement it," and then you come back and you carry on with the exact plan you had before you went out there, you're going to be just telling the people that you're not interested in what they have to say, that you have a plan and you're going to use it.

It's just like this letter that the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters sent to the Minister of Natural Resources. They start out and they say, "It is clear that you intentionally misled members on more than one occasion." They say that in their letter, so they must have the people very upset when they sit down and write a letter like that to the minister. I'm concerned that's the type of letter you're going to get relative to this legislation unless you actually implement the changes you've been asked to make. Better than that, I would ask that you just withdraw the bill.

To the Minister of Agriculture, I know the priorities that he must have in mind for government and what the people want. To spend the time and money on legislation like this is just not productive. With that, thank you.

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** I'm pleased to have the opportunity to rise today to speak to this motion. I think it's fitting and appropriate that we be talking about the family farm in rural Ontario in this House. So often we spend our time in this House talking about things that I do not feel are relevant, necessarily, in rural Ontario, so I'm pleased that we have a motion today that some members from rural Ontario can rise and speak to and talk about the family farm and its importance in rural Ontario.

It's rather unfortunate, though, that when we get to the end of this motion, it deals with two parts of Bill 91 and suggests either we amend it or bring back the exemption as it was previous to the introduction of Bill 40. I think what we have here today is a motion that wants to pre-empt the amendments that will be brought forward with Bill 91, as the Minister of Labour has promised, and we, in cooperation with the Minister of Labour, have talked to the group that is continuing to meet and talk and discuss this bill. They're putting together some possible amendments that we will be bringing forward. So what we have here today is a motion that is sort of trying to pre-empt those amendments coming before the House during second reading.

1730

None the less, as I said earlier, I think it's important that we do have a motion here that talks to rural Ontario. A number of members have risen in the House today and talked about the importance of the family farm. Some of them have expressed concern that Bill 91, even after it's amended, will cause hardship to the family farm.

But some of us have lost our sense of what a family farm is. We talk about it in very romantic terms, and we use it, and we're talking about all farms. I'm going to speak in a minute about the size of some of the farms we have here in Ontario, but before I do that, I want to make a couple of comments about some of my colleagues across the way who have spoken to this motion this afternoon.

We had a concern raised by the member for Bruce about some of the closures of offices and the fact that this was an indication we were not committed to rural Ontario and the family farm. That is absolutely not so.

What we're trying to do is take the limited money we have and make sure it goes into service in providing assistance and support, direct support, for farmers and not simply into buildings and providing staff in offices where they're not necessarily needed. We're trying to respond to the needs of all farmers across rural Ontario and make sure that the money we do have goes directly to farmers.

The other point I would make in response to what my friend from Bruce said is that he mentioned stable funding as not being productive. In fact we brought stable funding, and probably one of the only things that I was insistent we have in that bill was that 25% of the revenues that were collected under the auspices of that bill would go back to the local organizations, at the county or at the regional level, because I want to see strong farm organizations at the regional level so that they can promote agriculture at the local level and not at some bureaucratic central or provincial level. That's something the member should take note of.

The other thing I would like to point out is that earlier today in the House we had one of the good rural members from Etobicoke waving a sign around which talked a little bit in response to Bill 91, that we were attempting to unionize. "Where's the family farm?" A group sponsoring those billboards is a group that's not very familiar with many people in rural Ontario. Many of the farmers, the people I talked to in rural Ontario, are curious where this group came from and what its support is of the



family farm, whether or not it supports supply management, whether it supports milk marketing boards, whether it supports safety nets whether they be GRIP or NISA, whether it supports crop insurance, and some of those things that are the lifelines for farmers in this province.

Many of the farmers in the farm groups I talked to believe the group that has been sponsoring these billboards do not understand farmers and farm organizations, do not understand what goes on on the side roads in rural Ontario, and have another agenda which is quite different from supporting family farms, but I'll leave that for some future debate. I'm sure we'll hear more about the billboard business in the future, but I would draw that to everyone's attention here in the House.

Moving on to the family farm issue and the size of the family farm, while this bill was being drafted in its preliminary stages, when the discussions were held with the farm organizations, with the labour groups which were sponsored by my ministry and the Ministry of Labour, there were several suggestions as to how this bill might be drafted.

One of the proposals that was on the table was that if there were fewer than five employees or fewer than 10 employees, there would be an exemption; this would not be included under the provisions for this bill.

I believe it was the labour group that put that provision forward hoping the farm groups would say: "Yes, that's a good idea. We can accept that." But it was the farm groups that said at the table, "No, we would like to just have everybody treated the same. Don't have any numbers put in." So they were willing to include all farms, knowing full well they're not particularly interested in organizing a farm or an operation with two, three, four, five, six employees. They're interested, if they're going to have organizations, in larger operations, and I would like to draw to your attention some 1991 census material which will speak to the issue of the family farm and how many farms we're talking about.

I believe it was earlier today that there was an exchange in the House between myself and the member for Victoria-Haliburton about the number of family farms that might be affected in his riding, and while I do not have a breakdown on a county-by-county level, I do have some numbers here in terms of size.

It deals with the number of employees on each category of farm, based on 1991 census data. If we take 10 as a reasonable number that you might have an organization set up a union on in this province of Ontario, with 10 or more person-years of work—in other words, 10 full-time people for a whole year—do you know how many farms there are in the province with 10 or more employees all year? There are 352 of them. That's the total in the whole province with 10 or more employees.

If you want to go up to 20 or more employees, which would be more of a reasonably sized operation, there are 126, total, in the whole province, and I could go on. If you want to go up to 50, there are 30 so-called farms in the province that have 50 or more employees full-time all year, and there are 13 with 100 or more.

Mr Speaker, if you think or anybody in this House thinks that someone with 100 employees is a family farm and they're concerned about the future of the family farm, then I have something wrong with my vision of what a family farm is. The last time I checked, if there were 50 or 100 employees, it wasn't a family farm; it was something else, but it wasn't a family farm. It may be involved in the production of agricultural goods, and that's great, but I don't think that's a family farm.

Even if we go down to the number 10 of employees who might be organized—and let's face it: We're bringing justice to the farm, because every other province, with the exception of Alberta, has provision for farm workers to organize collectively and bargain for wages. We're doing this by including what the farm side and what the labour side want, with provision that there be no strike and no lockout, and we're bringing in what was asked for in the task force; that will be here on the table, as the amendments are brought forward in the near future. I look forward to all members of the House putting away partisan politics and supporting the amended Bill 91.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I thank the honourable minister for his contribution to the debate and invite further debate.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I'd like to make a few comments with respect to this bill. I listened to the Minister of Agriculture and all his other names speak about the support he is getting from farmers across this province on this bill. I don't know who he's talking to, because I can tell you, the farmers in my riding—they are not large operations but are mainly small operations, and they don't understand it. They don't understand the philosophy behind it.

Most of them are family farms that may have at least two employees who work full-time, and they certainly have a number of seasonal people who work for them. That's the fear, of course: that if this legislation carries, it would be extended to the seasonal people. They are very concerned in my riding, which consists of the town of Caledon in the county of Dufferin. They have a lot of fear about the effect it's going to have on them.

The farming community has had a great deal of difficulty over the last decade in particular—and of course they look at all governments—difficulty in operating farms in this province, and this is one more thing: the fear particularly of the effect on the small farmer. What is it going to do?

Number one, to start, it's going to provide them simply with another level of bureaucracy they're going to have to deal with, and that's more cost they'll have.

I look at this resolution that has been put forward today by the Liberal opposition, and I might say I support this resolution, although I must confess I hear rumours, whether they're true or not, that your ministry is busy working on amendments to this legislation, that you've got some concerns with it, so probably the resolution is a little premature and we should see what you're going to do. My guess is, though, that we won't be very happy with the legislation as amended.

1740

I find it interesting that the government indicates the support it's had of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. If you listen to why the Federation of Agriculture worked with you—when I say “you,” I mean your ministry—in the drafting of this legislation, first, it didn't want this to be part of the Bill 40 legislation. Everyone in this province, whether you like it or not, is opposed—well, not everyone; of course the union leaders are in favour of Bill 40. But generally speaking, in my observation, certainly in my riding, the large percentage of the people in my riding are opposed to Bill 40. That was one of the fears the Ontario Federation of Agriculture had, that this legislation would simply become part of Bill 40.

The second reason, as I understand it, that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture supported it was that it wanted this legislation to be administered not by the Minister of Labour but by the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that as well, but that is not support of the principle of unionizing the family farm.

**Mr Klopp:** We're not.

**Mr Tilson:** Well, that's the picture the government is painting, that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture supports that principle. That, as I understand it, is how it came about, and that to me is a form of coercion.

I will say that the Ontario farm economy has never recovered from the economic devastation of the early 1980s. There's no question that since that time the Ontario farmer has had a great deal of difficulty in operations. This was caused by interest rates and, as you know, Minister, from falling commodity prices.

As we've moved into the 1990s, with your government in power, with the NDP government in power, it's been characterized by international subsidy wars and price supports which, for the most part, in my submission, have left Ontario farmers hung out to dry. So the farmer has experienced a great deal of difficulty in proceeding not only through the 1980s but through the 1990s.

They're fearful of this legislation. They're fearful of where you're taking them and whether particularly the small farmer is going to be in operation if this philosophy catches on. They're going to be put through the same fear as the manufacturing and other industries that are submitting that Bill 40 has completely caused problems in investment in this province.

Ontario farmers, as I say, are potentially faced with the disastrous prospect of supply management being destroyed and other major structural changes through trade negotiations. The general feeling in the farm community—I can certainly speak for my riding. I know the minister has stood up and said he's got a long list of letters he's received from farmers, but I can tell you, the farmers in my community, who are small farmers, have a general concern with this legislation.

I would suggest that if you have some amendments, you delay the implementation of this procedure. It's been suggested by my colleague that perhaps the bill should be repealed or withdrawn, and I would support that, particularly the way it stands now, but I await your amendments.

The general feeling in the farm community indicates that the prospect of higher wages and other costs associated with organized workforces are not needed. That's their concern. We're talking about keeping farms alive.

I had a farmer come into my office last week who simply said: “Bob Rae and Elmer Buchanan don't know who feeds them. They simply don't know who feeds them. Their socialistic philosophy is being spread to the farm, and it doesn't apply in a farm community.” That's what one farmer said in my community. It's a simple statement that I hope, Minister, you pay heed to.

In other words, there's a need to preserve the family farm, and I think that's what the general intent of this resolution being put forward is: to preserve the family farm.

Another factor which should be considered is the competitiveness of the Ontario agriculture and food industry. In this sense, agriculture is no different from the industrial sector, as it must compete with other Canadian and American jurisdictions for corporate investment. Minister, we in agriculture—and when I say “we,” I mean the province of Ontario—do compete like other industries do, yet this is making it more difficult to compete in this province.

We are already asking ourselves the question, “If you're in another jurisdiction, whether you're a European or whether you're an American or someone from Japan or other countries, would you invest in the province of Ontario?” One of the things they look at is our taxes. Another thing they look at is our labour laws. I can tell you, as I'm sure you know—if you don't know, you should read any daily newspaper that comes out—that investors are concerned with many of the pieces of legislation that have been put forward in this province. I can tell you that the unionization of the family farm is another fear that farmers and investors from within and outside this province are concerned with.

I'm just going to, in the final seconds, repeat many of the fears that have been put forward by the task force and apply to this legislation: that the already unstable economic climate in agriculture would be further threatened by modifications to the province's labour law. They fear higher labour costs. The expected result of an organized labour force would ultimately be passed on to the consumer because of the farm sector's inability to absorb the increase, and that's a general concern.

The people who are really afraid of this legislation are the people who are trying to buy food in this province, because the cost will be passed on to the consumer. So, the fear is that this would be particularly evident in Ontario supply-management commodities where a cost-of-production formula is used to determine prices.

I thank you very much for participating in this.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Dufferin-Peel for his contribution to the debate and invite further debate.

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** There are really two major reasons why we have presented this motion to the Legislature today. The first reason, perhaps most obviously, is because of our recog-



dition of the very important role that agriculture has always played in this province and that it must continue to play in the economy of this province. A number of speakers have spoken to the difficult times that agriculture has been experiencing, and there's no question that they are going through some tough times, that they're going through a lot of changes. But we in this caucus and in this party are absolutely committed to making sure that agriculture continues to be a vital part of the economy of our rural communities and of this province itself.

But the more specific reason for bringing this motion to the Legislature today was to be able to speak to what I can only describe as this government's betrayal of the agricultural community on an issue of very grave concern to farmers and to the future of farm operations.

We have absolutely no guarantee, after eight months, that the concerns of people in farm communities are going to be addressed by these, at this point, mythical amendments that the Minister of Labour has spoken to. I do not use a term like "betrayal" lightly, but having spent a lot of time talking to people in farm communities about their concerns, first with Bill 40 and then with Bill 91, I can only find that as a way of describing the way in which this government has dealt with the agricultural community in the ongoing debate about labour legislation.

I don't pretend that this is the only betrayal that the farmers of this province have experienced at the hands of this government. Certainly, we remember the government promising significant financial assistance to farmers during the 1990 election, although we recognize that that's just one of the many promises of that particular summer that have been broken in the last three and a half years. Then we saw them promise help again in the Hayes task force on farm finance and then again in the agriculture investment strategy that was announced in 1992, and little real assistance has actually materialized.

In fact, far from providing real, new assistance, the Ministry of Agriculture's budget has been reduced by some 8%, and this is despite the fact that these are indeed some of the toughest times that agriculture in this province has ever experienced. This is a time when our crop prices fell by 30%; when net incomes from the agriculture industry fell by 15%. What was the government's response to the kinds of problems that farmers have faced? It was a reduction in provincial programs.

Now, I'm sure the government would be quick to say: "Look, it's a tough time for government too. What else could we do? We're reducing everywhere." But I think farmers might well ask, if the government could increase the spending for the Ministry of Labour by some 13%—not a reduction but an increase in spending for the Ministry of Labour by 13%—why was the budget for the Ministry of Agriculture reduced by 8%, and what does this say about the priority that this government places upon agriculture and upon the concerns of farmers?

1750

Of course the government can talk a good game, and in fact it attempted to demonstrate its commitment to rural development and the future of rural communities by changing the name of the Ministry of Agriculture from

the Ministry of Agriculture and Food to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. But it doesn't do much to help agriculture, and there's no sign that it's going to do much for rural diversification either.

The Minister of Agriculture said that one of the realities of the name change for his ministry is that he's going to take on a new Ombudsman role, working with other ministries on behalf of farmers and farm communities and farm operations. I would say to the Minister of Agriculture today that the starting point for your work as an Ombudsman, Minister, should be to work with the Minister of Labour and to ask the Minister of Labour why he has not kept his commitment to farmers, why the Minister of Labour will not deal with the concerns that farmers and farm groups have been raising with this government for some three years.

We in the Liberal caucus have heard the concerns of farmers and we have raised their concerns in this Legislature. We echoed the concerns of farmers about Bill 40, the bill which removed the agriculture exemption from the Labour Relations Act and which now leaves farm operations with the threat of labour disruptions. I remember that at the time when these concerns were raised, the Minister of Labour seemed to recognize that farm groups had legitimate concerns and in fact he set up the agriculture labour task force to study the unique nature of agriculture and its relation to labour reform.

The task force members reasonably assumed that their recommendations would somehow have some effect on what happened in Bill 40. They believed the Minister of Labour and they believed the Minister of Agriculture when he said the family farm would not come under the Labour Relations Act. But Bill 40 went ahead and the exemption for agriculture was removed.

But the task force continued to do its work, to offer a reasonable set of recommendations to protect the agriculture industry, and a great many individuals and farm groups worked long and hard with the task force to find that reasonable framework, despite the fact that there was a clear intimidation presented by Bill 40 having been passed. A coordinating committee on labour issues was set up to work with farm representatives on the task force to find the ways, given the New Democrats' clear, unshakable ideological determination to unionize farms across this province, to yet give protection to family farms. It seems to me that it was ironic and more than a little unfortunate that when what farmers were needing was help in the struggle to survive, they had to spend so much of their energy just trying to minimize the damage this government was ready to do to farming.

But the work was done, the task force report was presented in the fall of 1992, and then just last summer, before the House recessed, the government responded with Bill 91, and Bill 91 is clearly not a response to what that task force recommended.

The minister has said, "But it is." He says the legislation was supported by farm groups, that there was broad consultation. The minister said last week he sees no real problems with this bill, and when I ask, "How is he going to respond to the concerns that we're hearing from people in the farm communities?" he talks about minor

housekeeping amendments and he says: "Have faith. We'll deal with the concerns."

We have not seen the amendments. No one is ready to accept the statement that the minister will fix this on faith alone, and I say clearly to this minister: Bill 91 needs fixing, and minor amendments, whatever the minister means by that, are not going to do the job.

The Minister of Labour somehow seems to feel that this is just an opposition issue, just something we raise in this Legislature to be critics of the government. If that's so, can he tell me why then farm groups, under the continuing work of the labour issues committee, found 11 major areas where Bill 91 fails to live up to the spirit and the word of the task force recommendations?

Why did Grant Smith of the Ontario Milk Marketing Board and chair of the labour issues coordinating committee send a letter to the Minister of Labour expressing their disappointment that Bill 91 failed to address the concern and respond to the consensus of the agriculture task force? Why, if this bill is supported by farm groups, did the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, the Christian Farmers Federation, the Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association and other commodities groups try to get this government to understand that Bill 91 is fundamentally flawed?

We have up to now in this House raised only those issues that are causing the greatest concern to farmers: the failure to provide separate legislation for agriculture, the failure to exempt members of the broader family from being forced to join a union, and the failure to make provisions to prevent strike action against family farms.

But fixing Bill 91, Minister, means dealing with each of the 11 flaws that have been identified in this bill, and fixing Bill 91 means answering these kinds of questions: Why have you refused to create a separate agriculture labour relations act? Why have you refused to create a separate agriculture labour relations board? Why have you refused to define "agriculture" under Bill 91? Why have you refused to implement provisions to prevent strikes from occurring under Bill 91? Why have you refused to implement a dispute settlement process recommended by the task force? Why do you refuse to implement the task force's proposed labour-management advisory committee? Why did you refuse to properly define "seasonal workers" under the legislation?

Minister, I cannot identify all the questions under those 11 flaws in Bill 91. We will wait to see the minister's amendments to see if they address any or all of these questions. We'll wait to see if he is ready to deal with Bill 91 and fix it in a way that really does respond to the concerns of farmers across this province. The farmers of this province need and deserve nothing less, and it is in

that concern that we have moved this motion today.

**The Speaker:** Mr Cleary, in the absence of Mrs McLeod, moved opposition day number 1, which stands in the name of the Leader of the Opposition.

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members; a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1757 to 1803.*

**The Speaker:** Would all members please take their seats.

All those in favour of Mrs McLeod's motion will please rise one by one.

#### Ayes

Arnott, Brown, Caplan, Carr, Chiarelli, Cleary, Cordiano, Cousens, Crozier, Cunningham, Curling, Daigeler, Eddy, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaitre, Harnick, Hodgson, Johnson (Don Mills), Jordan, Kwinter, Mahoney, McClelland, McGuinty, McLean, McLeod, Morin, Offer, O'Neil (Quinte), O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau), Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt), Poirier, Poole, Ramsay, Runciman, Sorbara, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Witmer.

**The Speaker:** All those opposed to Ms McLeod's motion will please rise one by one.

#### Nays

Abel, Akande, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Cooke, Cooper, Dadamo, Duignan, Farnan, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haack, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Huget, Jamison, Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), Klopp, Kormos, Laughren, Lessard, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock (Sudbury), O'Connor, Owens, Philip (Etobicoke-Rexdale), Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Silipo, Sutherland, Swarbrick, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

**The Speaker:** The ayes being 43 and the nays 59, I declare the motion lost.

Before adjourning the House, I remind all members that there is a special ceremony planned for the grand staircase, and perhaps members would be kind enough to use an alternative exit when leaving the chamber.

It being past 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 1807.

## ERRATUM

| No. | Page | Column | Line | Should read:   |
|-----|------|--------|------|--|
| 100 | 5081 | 1      | 16   | this government to use blackmail to impose our will on |



# CONTENTS

Tuesday 5 April 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|                                   |      |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| <b>Youth unemployment</b>         |      |
| Mr McGuinty .....                 | 5359 |
| <b>Ruth Atkinson Hindmarsh</b>    |      |
| Mr Carr .....                     | 5359 |
| <b>Land-lease communities</b>     |      |
| Mr Wessinger .....                | 5360 |
| <b>Children's services</b>        |      |
| Mrs O'Neill .....                 | 5360 |
| <b>Burlington Day at the Dome</b> |      |
| Mr Jackson .....                  | 5360 |
| <b>J. Donald Baxter</b>           |      |
| Mr Paul R. Johnson .....          | 5360 |
| <b>Agriculture land</b>           |      |
| Mr Bradley .....                  | 5361 |
| <b>Ontario economy</b>            |      |
| Mr Hodgson .....                  | 5361 |
| <b>Hansard Reporting Service</b>  |      |
| Mrs Haslam .....                  | 5361 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|                                    |      |
|------------------------------------|------|
| <b>Social contract</b>             |      |
| Mrs McLeod .....                   | 5363 |
| Mr Laughren .....                  | 5363 |
| <b>Cancer treatment</b>            |      |
| Mrs McLeod .....                   | 5364 |
| Mrs Grier .....                    | 5364 |
| <b>Non-profit housing</b>          |      |
| Mrs Marland .....                  | 5365 |
| Ms Gigantes .....                  | 5365 |
| <b>Advertising</b>                 |      |
| Mr Stockwell .....                 | 5366 |
| Mr Rae .....                       | 5366 |
| <b>Economic outlook</b>            |      |
| Mr Phillips .....                  | 5367 |
| Mr Laughren .....                  | 5367 |
| <b>Workers' Compensation Board</b> |      |
| Mrs Witmer .....                   | 5368 |
| Mr Mackenzie .....                 | 5368 |

## Cardiac surgery

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Ms Carter ..... | 5368 |
| Mrs Grier ..... | 5368 |

## International trade

|                  |      |
|------------------|------|
| Mr Kwinter ..... | 5369 |
| Mr Rae .....     | 5369 |

## Agricultural labour policy

|                     |            |
|---------------------|------------|
| Mr Hodgson .....    | 5369       |
| Mr Buchanan .....   | 5369, 5370 |
| Mr Villeneuve ..... | 5370       |
| Mrs Fawcett .....   | 5370       |
| Mr Mackenzie .....  | 5370       |

## School facilities

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| Mr Mills ..... | 5370 |
| Mr Cooke ..... | 5370 |

## Recycling

|                  |      |
|------------------|------|
| Mr Tilson .....  | 5371 |
| Mr Wildman ..... | 5371 |

## PETITIONS

### Cancer treatment

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Mrs Caplan .....   | 5372 |
| Mrs Sullivan ..... | 5373 |

### Sexual orientation

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| Mr Cousens .....  | 5372 |
| Mr O'Neil .....   | 5372 |
| Mr Runciman ..... | 5373 |
| Mr Elston .....   | 5375 |

### Land-lease communities

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Mrs Mathysen ..... | 5372 |
| Mr O'Connor .....  | 5374 |

### Ministerial response

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr McLean ..... | 5372 |
|-----------------|------|

### Education financing

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr Morrow ..... | 5373 |
|-----------------|------|

### Firearms safety

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr Bisson ..... | 5373 |
|-----------------|------|

### Violence

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| Ms Poole ..... | 5373 |
|----------------|------|

### Medical examinations

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr McLean ..... | 5374 |
|-----------------|------|

## Gambling

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| Mr Brown ..... | 5374 |
|----------------|------|

## Haemodialysis

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| Mr Jim Wilson ..... | 5374 |
|---------------------|------|

## OPPOSITION DAY

### Agricultural labour policy, opposition day motion number 1, *Mrs McLeod*

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| Mr Cleary .....     | 5375 |
| Mr Villeneuve ..... | 5377 |
| Mr Mackenzie .....  | 5379 |
| Mrs Fawcett .....   | 5382 |
| Mrs Witmer .....    | 5384 |
| Mr Elston .....     | 5389 |
| Mr Jordan .....     | 5390 |
| Mr Buchanan .....   | 5391 |
| Mr Tilson .....     | 5392 |
| Mrs McLeod .....    | 5393 |
| Negated .....       | 5395 |

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Introduction of member for Victoria-Haliburton

|                      |      |
|----------------------|------|
| The Speaker .....    | 5359 |
| Mrs Cunningham ..... | 5359 |

### Visitor

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| The Speaker ..... | 5361 |
|-------------------|------|

### Minister's comments

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| The Speaker ..... | 5361 |
|-------------------|------|

### Member for Victoria-Haliburton

|                      |      |
|----------------------|------|
| Mr Rae .....         | 5362 |
| Mrs McLeod .....     | 5362 |
| Mrs Cunningham ..... | 5363 |
| Mr Hodgson .....     | 5363 |

### Ministerial response

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| Mr Offer .....    | 5371 |
| Mr Charlton ..... | 5372 |

|                      |      |
|----------------------|------|
| <b>Erratum</b> ..... | 5395 |
|----------------------|------|



No. 108

N° 108

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 6 April 1994

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

Mercredi 6 avril 1994



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

*50th anniversary*

**1944–1994**

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 6 April 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 6 avril 1994

The House met at 1333.

Prayers.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### YOUNG OFFENDERS

**Mr Gilles E. Morin (Carleton East):** The members of the House may be aware that last week in Ottawa, a young man, Nicholas Battersby, was killed in an act of random violence.

We, as a society, cannot escape some degree of responsibility for the discouragement, aimlessness and despair of a generation of youth. Our society is suffering today, perhaps more than ever before, from a lack of purpose. We need to get back on track, not to turn back the clock, but to move forward.

We must also face reality. As politicians, we can do something about the problems posed by random violence involving youths. I suggest a two-pronged approach. The first part represents a huge task, that of giving our youth a stake in society. We must reinforce the message that lashing out at society hurts everyone, including them.

Secondly, we must drive home the message that ours is a civilized society founded upon the rule of law. While we understand the social and economic factors often at the root of crime, we cannot excuse the crime itself. There are never good reasons for committing crimes. Young people must know and understand that youth is not an excuse and that crimes of any nature carry consequences, both for the victim and for the perpetrator.

On behalf of all my colleagues of this House, I wish to extend to the Battersby family my profound sympathy.

### COMMERCIAL FISHING

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** My statement is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Minister, as you are well aware, Mohawk natives from the Tweed area were permitted to net 1,000 pounds of walleye fillets for sale at the SkyDome on Easter weekend. Between 2,000 and 3,000 spawning fish were illegally gill-netted for commercial purposes.

Ministry of Natural Resources staff at the Tweed district office report that the minister has decided not to press charges. By these actions, the minister has allowed the law to be broken and he has taken away his own staff's ability to enforce conservation. By encouraging illegal netting for commercial purposes, the minister has contradicted his own enforcement policy and has gone against the law as defined by the most recent Supreme Court decision.

Furthermore, as I should not have to remind the minister, allowing walleye to be netted during the spawning season is highly irresponsible, as it will threaten the population.

I ask that the minister put an immediate end to this blatant violation of Ontario's conservation laws, and I implore the minister to lay the appropriate charges.

### EASTWOOD COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** Too often, we hear the negative, versus the positive. We hear or read about things that have gone wrong, that could have been done better, criticism of the jobs being done by various people and, too often, criticism of our youth. I wish to address the criticism of our education system and our educators.

I rise today to say we have a world-class education system and world-class educators. The Ministry of Education and Training and all who are involved in educating our youth have much to take pride in.

That pride is being demonstrated by Eastwood Collegiate Institute, a school in my region. The teachers and administrators of Eastwood Collegiate want to recognize the hard work and dedication of their students. A decision was made to send bumper stickers to parents of students who are achieving and maintaining an average of over 80%.

Eastwood Collegiate Institute has taken pride in its educating efforts and in the efforts of its students. Over 200 bumper stickers have been sent out. Mr Famme, principal of Eastwood Collegiate, said: "Response has been very positive from both parents and students. Too often we hear the negative, and Eastwood Collegiate has decided to promote the positive and will continue to do so through other methods." Mr Famme said that he takes pride in the achievements of all the students at Eastwood Collegiate.

I must admit that I share that pride. My son Shawn attends Eastwood Collegiate and we received one of these bumper stickers which says, "I am the proud parent of an Eastwood honour student."

I would like to say congratulations to all the students and parents of these students. I commend Mr Famme and Eastwood Collegiate for their efforts in recognizing the achievements of our youth.

1340

### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming):** I believe my statement today is very timely while the Minister of Economic Development and Trade is in Halifax discussing interprovincial trade matters.

All of us in this country would like to see freer trade within Canada, and Ontario has recognized that the procurement policies of the province of Quebec are a stumbling block to this freer trade.

I have to ask why, then, is the Ministry of Natural Resources of this government purchasing tree seedlings



from Quebec growers when Ontario growers are not allowed to bid on any Quebec contracts?

This is a matter of fairness. I'm not asking for preferential treatment for Ontario growers. What I am asking is for the Ontario government to stop purchasing goods and services out of Quebec that are forbidden to be sold into Quebec.

I believe this is extremely important at this time, when the Ontario government is negotiating with Quebec to remove these trade barriers. Are we not weakening our bargaining position right now by carrying on business as usual? The tree growers of Timiskaming and all of northeastern Ontario deserve the support of their government so that they can provide the jobs for our citizens and supply the seedlings that will be our future forest.

#### ANCILLARY FEES

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** My statement is directed to the Minister of Education and Training. On March 23, in conjunction with the tuition fee announcement, you announced a freeze on ancillary fees charged by post-secondary institutions. You stated that you will not increase or allow increases in the ancillary fees until an agreement is developed by each institution with its students.

Students have been expressing their concerns with ancillary fees to you for months. On July 27, 1993, the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance and the Ontario Community College Student Parliamentary Association issued a joint press release expressing their concerns with the back-door tuition fee increases. They also released a position paper to you on this issue dealing with the effects of ancillary fees on students and offering concrete recommendations.

That was over eight months ago. The students have done their homework. Students have a right to know how the ancillary fees are being used. You, as a minister, have a responsibility to produce the guidelines for implementing this new ancillary fee policy as quickly as possible.

On Saturday, April 9, I will be attending the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance transitional meeting being held at the University of Western Ontario. They will be discussing matters that affect post-secondary education, including tuition fees and ancillary fees.

I look forward to participating in this meeting and urge you to carefully consider their views and their recommendations, as they are very concerned about an immediate response to this whole issue of ancillary fees.

#### JOBS ONTARIO TRAINING

**Ms Margaret H. Harrington (Niagara Falls):** I'd like to tell you about last March. On a Sunday afternoon, I visited several businesses in Niagara Falls with Maria Siciliano, who is the employer liaison for Jobs Ontario Training. She sets up and monitors the training program.

First we went to Can-Eng, a company located on the QEW near McLeod Road. They manufacture huge high-temperature industrial furnaces and sell them globally. There I met Denis Paris, manager of engineering, who introduced me to Milan Lenk. Milan is a young man, a former social assistance recipient, who was determined to increase his skills. He was hired temporarily and told his

employer about Jobs Ontario Training. He now has a permanent job and high-tech skills.

Second, we went to Stamford Hardware, a leading distributor of Canadian pre-built stoves and fireplaces. I spoke to Gene St Croix, who hired Stanley Bench through Jobs Ontario Training. Stanley is now installing gas fireplaces and learning on the job.

At Roman Cheese Products, a well-known frozen food manufacturer in Niagara Falls, Sam Chan chose Angie Damiano for a new accounting clerk. She had exhausted her UI and had good customer skills and is now receiving extensive training in computing. Sam says, "I received a mailer last year and contacted Jobs Ontario since it was such a good program."

I encourage more employers in Niagara Falls to contact Jobs Ontario Training now, because it really works.

#### TRANSPORTATION FOR THE DISABLED

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** Today is the second day that Wheel-Trans users are stranded at home without access to public transit. As many as 7,800 wheelchair users and perhaps 21,000 or more in total are affected by the breakdown in the service.

What does this mean for people who rely on Wheel-Trans to go to work, to school, to the doctor or grocery shopping? It means that many people are stranded at home. Some might lose a day's pay. Some might miss a final exam, be without food or miss a crucial medical appointment.

TTC general manager Al Leach has yet to find a solution to this pressing matter. He has done nothing and failed to provide adequate alternative modes of transportation.

Yesterday, as many as 70 Wheel-Trans users had booked rides to attend the meeting to complain about Wheel-Trans service and its inability to provide service to those who want it. Those people couldn't make the meeting. Why not? Because the vast majority were unable to get Wheel-Trans service to attend the meeting.

The events of the last few days underscore what has been a perpetual problem with Wheel-Trans service in the Metro area and the failure of the TTC and Al Leach to do anything about it. In fact, last year approximately 11% of the people who requested service were unable to get it.

I would like to quote from the vice-chair of the advisory committee to the TTC, who said, "If the regular transit system was retrofitted years ago to make it accessible, this fiasco would not have happened."

I would ask that the provincial government do something to assist. It owns Ontario Bus Industries, which is involved, and if they could assist the disabled in Metro, that would be very greatly appreciated.

#### TARTAN DAY

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound):** I would first like to commend and express my thanks to all my colleagues in the House for wearing their plaid in support of Tartan Day. I want to especially mention Mr McLean down there. I would especially also like to thank the pipers and the drums from Grey, Bruce and Wellington, from towns like Walkerton, Hanover, Durham and Mount

Forest, who took the time to travel here today to entertain us with traditional Scottish music. Also, to Scotty Duncan, a friend and a fellow Scotsman, a special thanks for your help and organization.

While Grey county is proud to have inherited the culture and industrious ways of our forefathers, we must be doubly proud of the people we have here today, and many others like them, who remain devoted to keeping this heritage alive. In addition, I am continually impressed year after year by the increasing number of young people in the pipe bands, as you noticed today. Keeping our children involved can only ensure the continued success of future Tartan Day celebrations.

As you know, today is Ontario's third official Tartan Day, recognizing the multicultural nature of Ontario and the contributions of the Scottish to the economic, political and cultural wellbeing of our province. April 6 also marks the anniversary of the declaration of Scottish independence made in 1320.

For this, I once again thank all of my colleagues in the House, both from my caucus, the government and the opposition, who voted three years ago today to proclaim April 6 Tartan Day and for their continued support for this celebration.

#### CANCER MONTH

**Mr Robert Frankford (Scarborough East):** April is Cancer Month. It is an opportunity to raise funds for research, to remind ourselves of the effectiveness of current forms of treatment—surgery, radiation and chemotherapy—and for families of those who have been afflicted to make some contribution to provide help to others. Most families have had some encounter, and everyone can play their part.

I want to take the opportunity to mention the importance and the possibilities of prevention. The government's tobacco legislation is an important measure for the prevention of many of the most common and deadly cancers, ones which have unfortunately been increasing rapidly in women. The role of sunlight, chemicals and other environmental factors is well recognized. I want to mention a recent authoritative study that shows the protective effect of breast-feeding against breast cancer. Such epidemiological research is important and very much needs to be encouraged.

Even when the disease progresses, there is much that can be done for relief. In Scarborough we are very proud of the PACT program, palliative care at home, provided by doctors and nurses in the community, a very humane and economical approach which is much appreciated by families.

There is a medical adage which I'd like to quote which I think goes beyond guiding physicians and is useful for governments. It's a French quotation. It is, "Guérir quelquefois, soulager souvent et conforter toujours."

#### VISITOR

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I know that you would wish to recognize a guest in your gallery, Ahmed Habib, who is a member of the Marland Youth Council, along with Tom Grzesiak, Deepak Mehmi, Caroline MacDonnell,

Karen Law, Tanya Maseelall, Erin Murphy and Natasha Grzincic. They are all members of the Marland Youth Council and are privileged to attend the House this afternoon. We thank you for your extension of the courtesy.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** While the member does not have a point of order, indeed the visitors are most welcome to our chamber this afternoon.  
1350

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### POLICE SERVICES

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** My question is to the Attorney General. At a time when there are difficult economic circumstances facing a lot of people in this province, there is still an issue which is of great importance to citizens across Ontario, and that is the issue of safety in the streets.

Last night, in a quiet restaurant in Toronto, an innocent victim was gunned down by an obviously ruthless gang who were proceeding to rob the patrons in the restaurant of their belongings.

We have heard from police forces across the province that the provisions of the social contract that you insist must be applied to every sector, even those which the public would consider to be essential, are causing damaging cutbacks in service and resulting in the increased opportunity for crime.

Will you now abandon the senseless application of the social contract to police forces and restore the level of funding that will help deter violent crimes such as that which was committed last night?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Premier.

**Mr Bradley:** No, I'm sorry. It was to the Attorney General.

**The Speaker:** I'm sorry: the Attorney General.

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** I'm referring it to the Solicitor General, sir.

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** I appreciate and understand the question from the member of the opposition. I remind him that the direct supervision of police services is of course the responsibility of local police services boards. They set their own budgets.

There's no question that the expenditure control plan has an impact on all services provided by the public, whether that's health care, education, police services, all throughout. We need to find ways of restructuring services to maintain those services but deliver them in a way that allows us, quite frankly, to be able to afford them. I believe that municipal governments, as well as this government and the federal government, understand that.

Certainly, as I speak to my counterparts across Canada, other solicitors general and the federal Solicitor General, through the RCMP, are facing the same kind of pressures and, quite frankly, are taking the same kinds of measures that we are. We continue to work with municipalities and police services boards to find the ways of delivering the service in the best way possible. I'm sure the member and all members of this House would join us in that effort.



**Mr Bradley:** It is your role as a government to govern; that is, to choose; that is, to establish priorities. Your insistence on cutting police services by applying the social contract to all sectors, even essential sectors, is having an impact on the ability of the police to carry out their responsibilities. It will result, for instance, in the cutting of community policing services or not even starting up community policing services in many parts of the province. It gives criminals the impression that their chances of being caught and punished are rather slight.

Will you, along with the Attorney General of this province, demand that the Premier and your cabinet colleagues provide the police with the tools and staff that are required to fight crime in this province?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** I can't help but be disappointed at a member who has been around as long as the honourable member has and who puts such rhetorical comments across the floor at a time when his own leader has talked about the fact that the cuts we made weren't enough. She went on to say there ought to be deeper cuts and greater cuts, yet the opposition in this province provides us with no alternatives as to how it would maintain services and how it would restructure government. All they do is go for the cheap platitudes when the moment is right and say, "It's not enough; you should cut more," and then stand up and talk about what some of the implications of managing change are when you do deal with fiscal constraint.

This government has been very upfront and open about this process. I don't deny for one moment the pressure that municipalities, police services, all of us in public life are under, but to make the kinds of comments the honourable member has and not offer up alternatives that are constructive I believe does a disservice to the many years that he's put into this place and to the alternatives that the opposition should be providing.

**Mr Bradley:** The alternative is one which I think most people in this province and country would be prepared to see implemented. That is, there are services that government provides that people are prepared to pay for. I would suggest to the government, and particularly to the Solicitor General and the Attorney General, that the fighting of crime, services of crown attorneys, services of police, are services that people are prepared to pay for.

I ask the minister—and this is why I directed the question to the Attorney General in the first place. He would be aware of the random drive-by shooting that took place in Ottawa last week. It says:

"Plainclothes and uniformed officers cornered the youths, about 16 or 17 years old, as they drove away from their apartment building in a stolen passenger van.

"Three of the youths, police say, had been riding in another stolen car just 72 hours before. The occupants of that car terrorized parts of Ottawa for 30 minutes Sunday night, firing bullets into at least four businesses.

"During the rampage, Nicholas Battersby was killed as he strolled along Elgin Street."

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Bradley:** When the Attorney General attended the meeting of justice ministers of Canada very recently, last week or the week before, did the Attorney General put forward the case for the toughening of the Young Offenders Act so that we could deter the kinds of crimes that are being committed, in one case in Toronto, the other case in Ottawa and across this province?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** Again, I think the honourable member can hear from some of my colleagues present how dismayed we are that he would choose to take individual tragedies like this and try to wrap them up into rhetorical politics at a time when everybody is struggling as best they can to provide the essential, necessary services in a way that meets the needs of Ontarians.

I can say to the honourable member that when we met with his party's federal counterparts, they talked about the need to provide services in a way that we can afford; they talked about the need to provide crime prevention strategies, a crime prevention council; they talked about the need to review the Young Offenders Act with a view to ensuring that it does meet the needs of Canadians.

On all those points, we supported his federal counterparts because they're right on the money. We will continue to do that because these are critically important issues for the people of Ontario. But to wrap them up in the way the honourable member has done today truly is a disservice to the kind of leadership people are looking for from us.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** To the Minister of Health: What would this province be like without emergency services and the ability to respond at times that emergencies arise in our various communities around the province, and what are you doing to ensure that emergency services are available for our communities around the province?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** Emergency services take a variety of forms, whether it be transportation or whether it be the coverage of hospitals and physicians, as is a difficulty we're having in some of the small rural hospitals. Let me assure the member that the responsibility for providing emergency services lies in a variety of places—the ministry, the hospitals, the physicians as well as the emergency services—and they are, in this province, provided very well, and our ability to meet the needs of emergencies, despite our record of constraining costs, is unparalleled.

**Mr Elston:** I would like the minister to tell me why she has been unable to come to grips with and solve the problem of physician coverage of emergency rooms in the small rural hospitals around this province. This has been an issue which has been brewing for months and has resulted in letters being sent to her from places like Wingham, from Goderich, from several other of the communities in my area—Red Lake and other places.

1400

I want this minister to tell us why, although she's promised all of these places that she would have a policy solution to the problem, she has done nothing to solve the

problem of physician coverage of emergency rooms in rural Ontario.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** First of all, let me say to the member that he's wrong, that a great deal has been done to deal with the long-standing issue of providing emergency coverage in small rural hospitals.

In our agreement with the Ontario Medical Association last year, we confirmed their willingness to work with us to try to provide physicians in underserved areas. We established a joint committee between the Ontario Medical Association and the Ontario Hospital Association to try to deal generally with a problem that applies in rural areas in the south as well as in the north.

Unfortunately, we have not been able to come to a solution that meets the needs of all parties. Largely that is because the Ontario Medical Association believes there needs to be extra money provided over and above what physicians get through the fee-for-service system in order to provide this coverage. We believe, as we negotiated with the OMA for \$3.8 billion worth of payment to the province's 20,000 physicians, that within that the funding must be found to allow them to continue the coverage they have provided.

**Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora):** Minister, your answers and your promises just aren't good enough. You just don't seem to have a grasp of the magnitude of this problem.

We now have over 6,000 people in my riding without emergency services. These people have been without coverage since last Monday night. If there's a car accident or a major mining accident in Red Lake tonight, there won't be a doctor in Ontario to take care of the injured. This is just unacceptable, and it needs to be fixed today. Minister, you must work with me this afternoon to fix this problem. Words and promises are just not good enough.

I have a letter dated today from the administrator of the Red Lake Margaret Cochenour Memorial Hospital. They are asking for an immediate resolution to this problem. I invite you to come with me to my office to phone the administrator and suggest to him what the solution will be to service the constituents in my riding. You've misled the people of Red Lake, you've misled me and you have misled my constituents.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. The honourable member for Kenora knows better. He has posed a very important question, but I would ask him to withdraw the unparliamentary language which he has used.

**Mr Miclash:** Mr Speaker, this minister misled the constituents of my riding, myself—

**The Speaker:** No.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The honourable member, as I know him, has a respect for Parliament. I would ask that the honourable member reconsider and withdraw the unparliamentary language.

**Mr Miclash:** I hear the Minister of Transportation heckling over there. Maybe he has a solution. I will not withdraw my comments. The minister has misled the

constituents in my riding of Kenora.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. I ask the honourable member for Kenora to come to order.

The honourable member leaves the Chair with no alternative. If the member refuses to come to order and refuses to withdraw unparliamentary remarks, then he will have to be named. I ask the member to come to order.

**Mr Miclash:** I will not withdraw.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Kenora, who refuses to come to order, is now named. Mr Miclash, you are named. I ask you to voluntarily withdraw yourself from the House and from the committees of this House for the balance of this sitting day.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Since the honourable member refuses to leave voluntarily, I ask the Sergeant at Arms to please escort the member from the chamber.

*Mr Miclash left the chamber.*

#### ONTARIO HYDRO AGREEMENT

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** My question is to the Premier. Is it the policy of this government now that when jobs are declared surplus these jobs will in fact be left in place for up to two years of pay while the jobs are declared surplus?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I again would say that this is an approach the member has in asking a question which I congratulate, because I have literally no idea what he's referring to or what he's talking about.

Just so everybody knows what the game is that he's playing, it means that I can't refer the question to someone who might know more about it.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** If the issue is about Hydro, I'll refer the issue to the Minister of Environment and Energy; if it's concerning the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, I'll refer it to the minister for Management Board. Perhaps you could tell me which one.

**Mr Stockwell:** I look for your assistance, Mr Speaker. Who now am I addressing the question to?

**The Speaker:** When the member posed a question to the Premier, the Premier provided a reply. It is now your opportunity to place a supplementary. The Premier may wish to refer that to another minister, but we await your question.

**Mr Stockwell:** I ask again, you can then refer a supplementary question?

**The Speaker:** You may now place a supplementary question.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'll go back to the Premier, then. Mr Premier, that was certainly unintentional, and I will apologize for not briefing you a little further on that first one. According to the deal reached last week at Ontario Hydro, staff—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.



**Mr Stockwell:** Very important, Mr Speaker. According to this deal, those who are "currently surplus or becoming surplus shall have their search notice period extended to the earlier of placement in a vacancy placement opportunity or March 31, 1996."

What has happened, in other words, is that employees can continue to be paid even though there is nothing for them to do, and according to this agreement that was struck, that this party stood and congratulated each other about, this deal says surplus employees at an average salary of \$65,000; that's the rule of thumb at Hydro. If even 1% of Hydro staff are considered surplus in each of the next two years, that's \$30 million that taxpayers are going to pay people to do nothing. So I ask you, Mr Premier, what is the total tab for last week's deal of the century?

**Hon Mr Rae:** Mr Speaker, when I was growing up, on the Ed Sullivan Show—we used to watch it every week—there was a character on Ed Sullivan called Professor Irwin Corey. He used to talk for several minutes and I could never understand what he was saying; that was the whole point of the exercise. Whenever I hear a question from the honourable member for Etobicoke West, I reminisce on the subject of Professor Irwin Corey.

All I can say to the honourable member—I would say to him seriously in reply, because I gather what he's talking about is a partial reading of a partial document of a partial understanding of a document that is yet even to be ratified by the people who are being asked to ratify it—I would ask him that perhaps he might cool his jets until we've all had an opportunity to let the Hydro workers vote on an agreement that has been signed, and we can then discuss the nature of that agreement before the House.

1410

**Mr Stockwell:** Let's deal with the issue at hand, which is the contract. I have a copy of the contract. I'm surprised that you don't have a copy of the contract, Professor. I'll put to you, Professor Premier, speaking of not understanding an answer, that in this contract it says clearly, on page 5, that those positions that are surplus will be declared surplus and the persons will continue to come into work for up to two years to do nothing, to come into work, report to work and not have a job. I report to you, Mr Premier, that it says that on page 5 of the contract.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** That's not what it says.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'll read it for the minister's own understanding: "During this time period, staff who are currently surplus or become surplus shall have their search notice period extended to the earlier of placement in a vacancy placement opportunity or March 31, 1996." It's very clear. Your management has agreed to this. They said that if your job is surplus, you'll have two years to find another job; if you don't, then they'll buy you out through a severance package. That's what it says, Professor Premier.

What is your response? It's going to cost the taxpayers

\$30 million if 1% of employees are declared surplus.

**The Speaker:** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Stockwell:** Simply put, are we now going to pay Hydro staff to come to work to do nothing?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I have always made it a rule, I have always made it a point—and I would dearly love to change my approach today, but I will not because it would be unwise to do so—that when an agreement has been negotiated between two groups and there's a process of ratification, not to comment in the middle of the discussion, the middle of the vote and the middle of the ratification that's under way. That's good public policy. It's been followed by every other Premier who has ever been Premier, Conservative, Liberal or New Democrat. There actually haven't been any other New Democrats, but that's another thing. I think that's a good approach.

What I would say to the honourable member is that what he's doing is he's taking one paragraph or one clause totally out of context.

**Mr Stockwell:** That is all that is there.

**Hon Mr Rae:** If I may reply, because he took a fair bit of time in making the point that I gather he was trying to make, he did not refer to any of the other cost savings which are contained in the contract. He referred to none of the things which the union has agreed to do in order to achieve an element of job security. He didn't talk at all about job retraining. He didn't talk at all about job reassignment. He didn't talk at all about the other elements. He did not talk about the fundamental fact of this agreement, which is, as Chairman Strong has said, from the point of view of the ratepayer, an agreement with no net additional cost to the utility. That is the critical point which the honourable member has chosen not to stress and not to mention, because he doesn't want to mention that as part of his discombobulated discombobulations with respect to the Hydro contract.

#### YOUNG OFFENDERS

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** My question is to the Attorney General. Prior to the release of New Directions, Volume Three, my party's discussion paper on justice issues, we consulted with people all over the province of Ontario. In each community, we heard that the Young Offenders Act was the most hated piece of justice legislation ever enacted.

Minister, it was reported that while you were in Ottawa discussing the Young Offenders Act you stated that we should not be punishing young offenders so severely. Do you really believe that the Young Offenders Act is not too lenient? Because I can tell you it is not what most Ontarians believe.

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** The Young Offenders Act may be hated, but it's hated largely because it's misunderstood and misrepresented, quite frequently. We, along with all of our sister provinces and the federal government, were unanimous in saying we were very concerned about violent interpersonal crime and very serious about looking at the Young Offenders Act.

What we did say was that we did not think piecemeal

solutions, such as a sudden mandatory sentence, were the way to go without the year-long study that the ministers had already agreed to under the previous government last May. What we did say was that there are many complications in terms of the proposal that was proposed by the red book of the current Liberal government. What we were asking the Liberal federal minister for was a commitment to study the whole act so that we could look at ways in which we could ensure that the Young Offenders Act was made more effective.

What I did say was that in the less serious, property-oriented, minor crime area we are incarcerating young people at unheard-of levels, even higher levels than under the Juvenile Delinquents Act, which the YOA was meant to replace. In that way indeed the act is too punitive, because it does not give alternative measures at the low end of the scale.

**Mr Harnick:** Minister, the difference between your party and mine is that we believe the Young Offenders Act should be made much tougher, and when we consulted with the people of Ontario, they agreed. The people on your side of the Legislature don't believe that the people in Ontario should have any opinions.

The federal government recently commissioned a study of the Young Offenders Act, written by Frederick Mathews, community psychologist with Central Toronto Youth Services, which concluded that the act provides no deterrents. I quote from the report: "The majority view is that the Young Offenders Act is too lenient on first-time offenders and on those who commit violent offences."

Minister, what specifics did you take to the table in Ottawa to amend the Young Offenders Act?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** What we were doing at the table was first of all discussing the process by which we would amend the act.

I would say to the member that there are many differences between our party and his party, and one of the differences is the extent to which we do believe in consultation. We believe in looking at not just the answers we want to hear but the answers we actually hear in doing research.

He asks what I took to the table. I took to the table a long history of experience with working on these issues. He can quote his sources. I can quote mine; from the London Family Court Clinic, for example, Dr Alan Leschieb, who has a very different view of the YOA and a very different view of how we ought to be looking at changes.

I would repeat that we are not saying that there should not be changes and that the act should not be looked at to see if it can be more effective. We agree that it should. What we are saying is that the kind of piecemeal, politically expedient actions that have been suggested are not good public policy and ought not to be condoned by this province.

**Mr Harnick:** Minister, you might consult but you don't listen. I recognize the need to rehabilitate young offenders, but our number one priority should be deterring crimes before they happen. The government should be saying that youth crime will be dealt with severely and

that the Young Offenders Act is no longer a joke to be laughed at.

The Attorney General of Manitoba brought forth concrete recommendations to strengthen the Young Offenders Act. In New Directions, Volume Three, we provide concrete recommendations to deal with this act. Minister, what recommendations do you have to increase the deterrent effect of the act to stop people from committing crimes?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** We've already taken a great many actions in this province to swing the emphasis within the criminal justice system to looking at and to enabling us to use our resources to ensure that we are dealing effectively with serious crimes. The whole response that we have made to the Martin commission report, which involves the whole criminal justice system, including the YOA, means that we are working very specifically to try to allocate our resources directly to the issues of serious interpersonal violent crime, which we agree with the member is of great concern to the citizens of Ontario.

We had many suggestions to the federal government about changes that could be made to help us, as provinces, release some of our resources to look at the way in which closed and open custody is being offered, to look at alternative measures that could help us to shift our resources, to enable us to make much better decisions. We also are very empathetic with the position of the federal government that mandatory treatment for young offenders be made possible.

We are certainly prepared to look at changes. We are simply not prepared to take the politically expedient route that is being suggested by all the Conservative provincial governments in this country.

1420

#### DRIVERS' LICENCES

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Minister, as you know, last week, when there were long lineups for people trying to get drivers' tests prior to the implementation of graduated licensing, you told the press that people in the lineup and people ready to take the test would be given a rain check up to 4:30 on Friday. Despite that, however, hundreds and perhaps thousands of people were turned away on Thursday by your officials at the office here on Bay Street and in other offices, as far as we've been able to determine.

Many people's livelihoods depend on having a driver's licence. Unquestionably some of those turned away were depending on receiving a driver's licence to secure or maintain a job before the new law applied. Indeed, I know of one man who was faced with the prospect of losing his job if he did not obtain his learner's permit that day. In fact, there was no action taken to improve this situation until a complaint was filed with the ministry.

I would like to ask the minister why he did not ensure, when he was grandstanding for the press, that his officials were carrying out the policy he enunciated.

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** I welcome, by way of a question, the opportunity to pay tribute to the civil service across the province of Ontario:



those front-liners, those men and who for the past month have gone well beyond the call of duty to serve the would-be drivers in the province of Ontario.

As often happens, it's not human frailty; maybe more so human nature, not unlike last-minute shoppers. You will recall vividly, for you were here, Mr Speaker, that when the graduated drivers program received royal assent, it was done unanimously. All three parties in the House said we must provide a deterrent and yet provide encouragement to make the system safer.

Thousands of people had three months to show up. They waited, in many cases, until the last minute. We've honoured, as a service provider, our commitment. Anyone who showed up was given a chance to go under not the current but the previous system. We will honour our commitment. We were imaginative, innovative. By way of a rain check, the deadline has been extended for one extra month for those people who showed up within working hours.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister please conclude his response.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** The system is working well. It has been well received by the general public.

**Mr Murphy:** It's not innovative; it's incompetent. You failed to make sure that your own officials knew what you'd said so they could carry it out. In fact, there was one person, Paul Whitaker, from my riding who managed to get in only because he complained to my office. We had to phone you, and it was only after that that you phoned down to the Bay Street office and got any action.

I want to know, Mr Minister, what you're going to do to the hundreds—in fact, Mr Whitaker reports, thousands—of people who were turned away on that day who were there based on your commitment that if they were there they'd get a rain check? What are you going to do to make sure those people who were turned away get a chance to get a rain check so they can get a learner's permit, based on the commitment you've made and aren't living up to?

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** We're doing everything that is humanly possible. Let me give you an example in real life. Last Thursday, right before the deadline, right out here at Queen's Park—and you're right, hundreds of people were lined up trying to get under the deadline—as they were standing, 30 people from Downsview, public servants who put the welfare of the line ahead of their own, worked countless hours of overtime. We coordinated effort. Nobody is doing without. Nobody is being deprived. First you write the test and then you're in the wheel. You wait your turn to get your driver's test.

We will do everything possible. We have seven million people in the province of Ontario with drivers' permits in good standing and each and every year brings another 250,000. It's a massive endeavour. We bring home the daily bread and we do it well. Not one citizen will be deprived of the privilege to access the system.

#### SOCIAL CONTRACT

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** My question is for the minister responsible for the social contract, the

Minister of Finance. Everyone knows the broader public sector has found that the social contract hasn't been working and is not fair. The social contract hurts everyone with its injustice, and the greatest irony is that it will not net the government of Ontario the \$2 billion in savings this year or lead to long-term government restructuring. The horror show continues.

Today, the Toronto Star reported that the North York school board trustees will no longer lose pay under the social contract. They had their pay cut last year under the social contract. This year there is no social contract cut for trustees. A loophole has allowed them to escape from the clutches of the social contract at the expense of taxpayers and everyone else.

Do you intend to take action and will you find a way to reinstate the pay cut?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I gather the member for Markham is suggesting that the social contract should work and should be applied to the trustees in North York. I think that's what I heard him saying. So he must be expressing some kind of confidence in the social contract and the way in which it should be applied out there across the province.

I did read that article and I was surprised that the trustees would themselves make that decision. I was surprised at that. It is quite conceivable that they have found a way in which they can be exempt from it. If that's the case and if it complies with the letter of the law, of the social contract, then of course they have a right to do that and they will bear the wrath of their ratepayers accordingly. But if they've decided that and that is the correct interpretation of the social contract, I don't think I'm prepared to bring the social contract back into this assembly for an amendment at this time.

**Mr Cousens:** I fear the Minister of Finance is shortchanging everyone unless he guarantees some equity. Other workers across Ontario are being placed at a financial disadvantage in favour of school board trustees who have a fresh interpretation.

The intent of the social contract was to reduce the salaries of all public sector employees, including the salaries of politicians. Why then can the North York school trustees not also participate in this program? They did last year. This year they have a fresh interpretation.

I'm asking you directly, will you personally look into this and take action to direct that the school board trustees be reinstated under the social contract?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** I think it's a fair question from my friend from Markham. I believe, if I understood the article correctly, that they were using the tax-free allowance of their remuneration to say that was not remuneration per se but rather—

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Expense.

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Yes, an expense allowance. I was somewhat taken aback by that interpretation, although, as I say, it may be technically correct. But I don't disagree with the sentiments of the member for Markham in being surprised that the trustees did that. I will make sure that what they've done is within the context or within the spirit of the law; namely, the social contract. If it violates

the social contract, then of course we will make sure they comply. If, on the other hand, it does not violate the social contract and they have simply found a loophole which they can exploit, then I don't think there's room for us to intervene, since they would be complying with the act itself.

#### MINISTRY RELOCATION

**Mr Gary Malkowski (York East):** My question is to the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation. The minister has announced plans for certain functions within the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation to relocate to Niagara Falls. I have been approached by people in my riding of York East who have advised me that this relocation is going to affect them. For some, there are many good reasons that prevent them from being able to relocate.

I understand the reasoning for the move in diversifying and stabilizing the economic base of outlying communities like Niagara Falls. However, it does concern me that our government would endorse the creation of jobs in one region at the expense of taking jobs from others. We are talking about people with livelihoods, homes, families and commitments who are going to be left without jobs. We all know that the topic on everyone's mind these days is jobs: creating jobs, getting jobs and of course keeping their jobs.

My question is, what types of training packages are you going to offer these people who are being left behind, who are already highly trained as museologists or curators, for example?

1430

**Hon Anne Swarbrick (Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation):** I appreciate the concern that's being raised by the member for York East. There's no doubt that any time people are faced with the kinds of insecurities that these life choices pose to people, of course people get very nervous, which is why I personally, along with my deputy minister, recently held a full meeting of all the staff of our ministry, as well as meetings by their management folks, as well as passing out benefit packages and what have you to them, to try to make sure that people have the full information available to them.

I believe that the package we've prepared is a very fair one from an employer's and an employee's perspective. It includes helping to give people the opportunity to get acquainted with the new community, to make an informed decision about whether or not they wish to relocate to that new community. Should they choose not to relocate, there are very clear entitlements to job offer guarantees, to retraining commitments for people, to job trading possibilities as well as relocation packages available, should they choose to relocate to the new community.

I believe it's a fair package, and my ministry staff and I are certainly doing everything we can to help protect the entitlements of those employees—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Swarbrick:** —going through this kind of change in the best possible supported way.

#### AGRICULTURAL FUNDING

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** My question today is for the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. You and your colleagues were very quick yesterday to point out your commitment to agriculture, but behind the loud bravado, you are really far from providing any new assistance. Your ministry's budget has actually declined since your government took office. The 1993-94 agriculture budget is \$49 million less than it was when the Liberals were in office. I might add that it's now fast approaching the record low levels of the Tories.

Can you explain the 8% reduction in funding which has led to numerous cutbacks in services and programs, and can you assure this House and all farmers out there that the upcoming budget will increase the Ag and Food portion back to the Liberal level of over \$500 million, or at least, at the very least, hold the line and not decrease any further?

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** I think the member is just using one criterion here in measuring the effectiveness of government and the effectiveness of programs. I would like to take the member back to 1990, for example, when this ministry and this minister put out \$50 million in interest subsidies. In 1991, we found that this wasn't enough, that we had to add an additional \$15 million, so in 1991 we put \$65 million into interest assistance programs for farmers.

We soon discovered that that \$65 million didn't go to farmers. The cheque went to the farmers and the farmers took it to the banks. We decided we needed new types of programs that we could afford that would put money into farmers' pockets. We knew that we didn't have enough money in the treasury to put it directly, so we looked for other vehicles. We've done a very good job of putting other programs together that have put money into the pockets of farmers indirectly through many of the things we've done with the agriculture investment strategy.

**Mrs Fawcett:** You might say that you have created new programs, with your added responsibilities in Rural Affairs, we then should expect the budget to increase in the Ag and Food portion.

I recall that you closed down colleges and you also cut out such good programs as the environmentally sound land stewardship program; you sold the stock yards. I just wonder where all that money went. I don't think there were that many new programs created with all this extra money that you have and I just bet the old wily Treasurer has poured it into the dark hole of the consolidated revenues.

But Minister, at the same time that your budget for Agriculture has decreased, other ministry budgets have increased. In fact, the overall government spending has increased by 15% since your government took office. Now, that leaves Agriculture 23% in the hole. Of course, though, the Ministry of Labour's funding increased 13%—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mrs Fawcett:** —and the Ministry of Citizenship 58%.



Minister, they say you've been sitting at the cabinet table for rural Ontario and the ag-food industry; if you have, how can you possibly explain these inequities?

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** To hear the member ask her supplementary, you would think that farmers did very well during the period from 1985 to 1990, with all the money that was around in those years that could be sort of put in the mail and sent out to farmers. It's interesting to note that during that five-year period of Liberal administration in this province, there were 359 farm bankruptcies in this province. During the last three years—1991, 1992 and 1993—there were a total of 58 bankruptcies in farm businesses in this province.

I think that in terms of what we've been able to do to assist farmers in continuing to be viable operations, that even if our budget is not increasing—obviously we'd like it to increase; we obviously would like to have more money to spend—we've been able to utilize the money we have to assist farmers and make sure the money we have doesn't go to banks and big financial institutions but goes to assist farmers and rural people in terms of maintaining their lifestyle.

#### VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have a question for the Minister of Labour and it concerns the requirement of the workplace health and safety act, Bill 208, to force members of volunteer fire departments to attend three weeks of occupational health and safety training at municipal expense. Small municipalities' volunteer firefighters, the Ontario fire marshal and the Provincial Federation of Ontario Fire Fighters want to know where negotiations stand for getting some relief for volunteer fire departments. Will you tell us today, Minister?

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** On the issue of volunteer firefighters, I'll have to get back to the member across the way.

In general, I can tell him that in terms of the health and safety agency and the training programs, they're going quite well. We've had to move up some of the dates in terms of completion and we think it's going to be one of the success stories in terms of trying to deal with the injuries on the job in the province of Ontario.

**Mr Runciman:** It's regrettable the minister isn't aware of this concern. These volunteer firefighters will have to use their vacation time to take this training, volunteers who already donate their weekends and evenings to their communities. Not only that, it's the municipality which must pay for the training and for lost wages while the volunteers are away from their own jobs. For small municipalities such as Elizabethtown in my riding, that's going to cost \$6,000. That's \$6,000 which could buy six new fire suits, fire suits they'll have to buy because your government has said these suits must be stock equipment by 1995.

Fire departments, municipalities and the Ontario fire marshal have all asked that firefighters be exempted from the certification training requirements. If an exemption is not granted, small fire departments will simply cut their volunteer rosters down to 19 in order to escape the

legislation, and I don't have to tell you that a smaller roster means fewer volunteers available to fight fires. Surely this is not the point of an act aimed at health and safety.

Minister, will you compel the Workplace Health and Safety Agency to resolve this problem in the next 30 days?

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** I don't think anybody is in a position to say we're going to change one program or another within 30 days. I simply want to tell the member across the way that I can't understand his question if he's saying that we don't need the better or safer suits in terms of the firemen, whether they're in a large or a small department. Surely you're not saying that we don't need an adequate health and safety training program for firefighters. This is exactly the intent of health and safety legislation in Ontario, and I'm a little bit surprised at the member across the way wanting to give second-class coverage to volunteer firefighters.

1440

#### COMMERCIAL FISHING

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. I recently received a letter from John Lewarne, vice-president of H.J. Heinz Co. He's concerned about the Lake Erie smelt quota for 1994. H.J. Heinz, through its subsidiary, Homestead Foods, has a major food processing plant in Wheatley. The harvesting and processing of smelt employs over 200 people. What is more, these jobs bring money into Ontario, because for the most part the product of smelt is exported to Japan.

H.J. Heinz, to be able to compete worldwide, has over the last two years spent several million dollars upgrading its processing facilities. However, H.J. Heinz is very concerned that its quota for smelt in 1994 will be limited. If this were to happen, it could have a ripple effect on the community. Mr Minister, are you able to assure us today that the smelt quota for H.J. Heinz for 1994 will be the same as, and perhaps even greater than, in 1993?

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** The member has asked a very important question with respect to jobs in southwestern Ontario. The reality is that there are a lot of pressures on the fish stocks in Lake Erie, both the smelt populations and the walleye populations. There are a number of users, principally the angling industry and the commercial fishery. As well, Lake Erie is used not only by Ontario interests but by interests from Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York. So the fishery on Lake Erie has to be allocated with all of those interests in mind.

The actual allocation recommendations come from the Lake Erie committee of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission. They held meetings on March 30 and 31 and they are coming forward with some recommendations. When we see those recommendations we will be able to allocate the smelt quota based upon a sustainable maintenance of the resource. So I can't give you any assurances today, but I think we can do that soon.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** He's not taking up your cause, Pat.

**Mr Hayes:** I know that the Liberal member there doesn't seem to be too interested, but a lot of people are across this province.

I appreciate what the minister has said. However, H.J. Heinz and others would certainly appreciate knowing how soon we'll know when the quotas would be announced. Can you give us any indication as to when this announcement may take place?

**Mr Sorbara:** Like before or after the election because the election is not going to do any good.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Mr Hampton:** I gather the Liberal members from Toronto don't think this is a very important question, but I know that other people in the province do, so I will attempt to answer over the voices from Toronto.

As I've indicated already, the Lake Erie fisheries managers will meet very soon, on April 18, I believe, to review the numbers. They will meet with the commercial fishermen, they will meet with sports fishermen and then they will be making their recommendations. Hopefully, after that we will be able to set the final quota allocations for this fishing season.

#### TRANSPORTATION FOR THE DISABLED

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** My question is to the Minister for Municipal Affairs. I know that you and many people are aware of the problem with respect to Wheel-Trans within the city of Toronto. My question is directed to transportation services for the physically challenged outside of Toronto, specifically Mississauga.

The minister will be aware that Transhelp in Mississauga contracts for specially equipped taxi service to provide assistance for the physically challenged. I've been informed that the use of specially equipped taxis gives Transhelp in Mississauga flexibility in improving service while at the same time reducing costs.

However, under current wording of the legislation, the city of Toronto can prohibit, within its borders, the pickup of the physically challenged by Mississauga cabs. This results in a situation where specially equipped cabs in Mississauga can transport the physically challenged from their homes in Mississauga to a point in Toronto, such as their doctors' offices, but those same cabs cannot pick up those persons. What happens is that the person who is physically challenged and has a doctor's appointment in Toronto must be picked up by a transportation service in Toronto, transported to the Toronto-Mississauga border, dropped off at that border, and then picked up, if you can believe it, by Mississauga transportation and taken to their home.

I know there is a stopgap measure in place now, but, Mr Minister, there has to be change to the legislation to have a certain permanence so that people can—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Offer:** My question is, will the minister be bringing in legislation so that those physically challenged outside of the Toronto area can rely on their own specially equipped transportation to take them to and

from doctors' appointments, wherever their doctor may happen to be located?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** I'm aware of the situation. Needless to say, like the member, I'm concerned about the situation. We have consulted with the office of the disabled and with the Ministry of Transportation. Indeed, the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation, George Dadamo, has been working with us and with the Ministry of Transportation and with the ministry of the disabled. We are looking at options that we have, in conjunction with the two municipalities involved, to resolve the situation.

**Mr Offer:** By way of supplementary, this is an issue which is not just specific to Mississauga but applies to Halton and a whole variety of municipalities just outside of the Toronto area, such as Scarborough and what not. It is clear that a small change in legislation will give to the physically challenged outside the Toronto area an assurance that the transportation facilities within their own area will be able to not only take them to their doctors' offices, but also pick them up.

Mr Minister, the question to you today is, will you bring in legislation? Will you commit to the physically challenged outside of the Toronto area that you will bring in legislation so that they can have an assurance of safe, secure, efficient transportation, wherever they happen to live? Yes or no?

**Hon Mr Philip:** I think I indicated earlier that we are looking at the situation and that we are looking at the possibility of an amendment. I trust that in the event that we do proceed with the appropriate amendment, we will have his support for speedy passage, not the usual filibuster that we get on most of the bills we introduce in this House.

#### LANDFILL

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a question for the Minister of Environment and Energy. You and your government have created a lot of havoc with respect to the creation of the three superdumps in the greater Toronto area. You've made a lot of people upset. I wonder if you could ease the minds of the residents of Caledon and York and Durham. I wonder if you would tell us what will happen if one or all three of the environmental assessments that are now scheduled for these three areas fail.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy):** I'm sure the member, who I know is very concerned in this matter, would not want me in any way to prejudge the process other than to simply say that, as he knows, the IWA process has been exhaustive and will continue to be so. They will deal with all of the issues related to environmental protection in preparing an EA recommendation. Then, when an Environmental Assessment Board hearing takes place, all of these matters will be dealt with.

If indeed a site is found not to be acceptable, it will be rejected, but I'm confident that every effort will be made to ensure that any proposal going to the EA board will be supportable and will be passed.

*Interjections.*



**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** You are wasting money, my friend. You are wasting money.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Will the member for York Centre please come to order.

**Hon Mr Wildman:** There is a continuous noise from the other side, Mr Speaker, but I'm trying to ignore it.

**Mr Tilson:** I don't know why we're bothering to have an environmental assessment with your attitude, Minister. You're telling us to trust the IWA process. No one has trusted you or your government or the IWA process since the day this whole system was started with 57 sites three years ago. The whole process stinks as much as the garbage that you plan to put in these three superdumps.

Minister, you have said that you're going to assume these three sites are going to be passed. I can tell you that that assumption doesn't exist. Will you now acknowledge that this system doesn't work? Will you now look at all alternatives? Will you look at incineration? Will you look at the long rail-haul? Will you look at all systems that are available for waste management in this province?

1450

**Hon Mr Wildman:** I won't respond to the long editorializing, which I believe is against the rules of the House, but I will say that the member has indicated that I assumed something. At no time during my response to his first question did I assume anything. I assured him that the process would be carried out to protect the environment and the interests of those involved.

The member has asked if I would deal with all alternatives. He specifically mentions incineration. He should know that the problem with incineration is that there is the question of the ash, and how we deal with the airborne ash and the residual ash and how that is land-filled is in itself a problem. Incineration does not get rid of garbage. It doesn't just disappear up the chimney; it has effects that can be very, very harmful in the atmosphere, and the question of the incineration ash and how it will be landfilled has to be dealt with. Incineration is not a solution; it is just one more problem.

**The Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired. On a point of order, the honourable member for Mississauga North.

#### MINISTERIAL RESPONSE

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** Mr Speaker, my point of order is pursuant to rule 33(a). You will remember on March 30 I posed a question dealing with a retreat that was taken by certain members in the social contract secretariat. My question was posed to the Chair of Management Board, who undertook to respond back to me. He said that he is not the minister responsible for this junket but undertook to me and to the Legislature to respond to the question I posed. To date, neither he nor the Minister of Finance has responded to my question.

Mr Speaker, I urge you, under the standing orders, to use your good offices to ask those particular ministers to respond to a question as to why there were 50 members of the social contract secretariat—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. The

honourable member for Mississauga North will know that he brought this matter to my attention previously. The point of order was dealt with at that time. There is nothing more that I can add to what I provided to the member on the previous occasion on which he raised the matter.

#### NON-PROFIT HOUSING

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Yesterday the Minister of Housing agreed to give a full answer to a question which I placed today. I would like to report to the House that the minister and I have agreed that she will give that answer tomorrow, and that is acceptable to me.

#### PETITIONS

##### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Gilles E. Morin (Carleton East):** I have a petition signed by over 400 people and it reads as follows:

"Whereas Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex,' drastically redefining the family as we know it;

"Whereas Bill 55 will make it illegal for people to make any public statement, written or oral, which ridicules, demeans or discriminates against a person on the grounds of sexual orientation, threatening free speech in a democratic society and the freedom of religion for historical Christianity, which does not condone homosexuality;

"Whereas Bill 56 will allow legal actions to be launched against any person or organization that promotes hatred or the superiority or inferiority of a person or class of persons because of sexual orientation, stifling the rights of Christians to voice views opposed to homosexuality on moral grounds;

"Whereas sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex;

"Whereas we believe that Bill 45, Bill 55 and Bill 66 would cause an enormous negative impact on our society over the long term because of the redefinition of fundamental institutions of marriage and family,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the House refrain from passing Bill 45, Bill 55 and Bill 66 and that 'sexual orientation' not be added to the Ontario Human Rights Code."

I affix my signature to this document.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I have a petition which says:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay

the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about the classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearm safety course or examination."

That's signed by many people from Elmvale, Hillsdale, Oro Station, Barrie, Guelph, Midland and Penetanguishene.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** I have a petition here from the good people of South Porcupine and Porcupine addressed to Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. The petition reads:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we do not desire to own,

"I/We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearm safety course or examination."

This is signed by a number of people from South Porcupine, Mr Hazelwood, Elliott, Malo etc, and I table the petition.

#### PHOTO-RADAR

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** I know that you wanted to recognize my friend who's been on question period all afternoon, Mr Speaker, but I appreciate the opportunity to address this petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It relates, of course, to the dreaded photo-radar.

"Whereas the NDP government of Ontario is planning to implement a photo-radar system to penalize speeding drivers;"—in fact, they've already implemented it; they just can't find the machines—"and

"Whereas the provincial freedom of information commissioner has ruled that the NDP's photo-radar system violates the province's protection of privacy legislation; and

"Whereas there may be a number of legal and constitutional challenges to the NDP's dreaded photo-radar legislation; and

"Whereas the photo-radar system will cost millions of dollars to set up and implement; and

"Whereas photo-radar fines involve no demerit pen-

alties—"thank goodness, I say—"which the Minister of Transportation has said are the only way to force the public to obey other highway safety regulations, such as the use of seatbelts; and

"Whereas the photo-radar legislation penalizes the owner of the vehicle even if they are not responsible for the violation;"—which is a serious breach of our civil rights—"and

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member please simply read the petition.

**Mr Sorbara:** "Whereas there have been concerns raised as to whether photo-radar technology will accurately measure the speed of all vehicles," sir—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Sorbara:** I can't be responsible for the length of this—"and

"Whereas a government newsletter quotes a ministry staff person admitting that photo-radar is only being implemented to bring new revenue to the province;"—that's serious—"and

"Whereas the NDP government is already wasting too much of the revenue it does receive,

"We, the undersigned"—here's the conclusion—"demand that the NDP government cancel its plans to implement photo-radar and cancel its photo-radar legislation."

It's signed by several constituents.

1500

#### EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas any person applying for a job should be judged fairly, on the merits of his or her qualifications, abilities and experience; and

"Whereas a person's colour, religion, race, gender, or other such characteristics should not enter into the equation; and

"Whereas Bill 79 will establish a quota system of hiring based on race, colour, gender or other physical characteristics; and

"Whereas employers should be free to hire the most qualified person for a given job,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We demand the government withdraw Bill 79, the Employment Equity Act."

I totally endorse this petition and have signed it.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICE

**Mr Peter North (Elgin):** To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Four Counties General Hospital in Newbury, Ontario, provides 24-hour emergency services to an area that covers the four neighbouring corners of Middlesex, Elgin, Kent and Lambton counties, approximately 16,000 people live in small towns, villages and rural sections of this area; and

"Whereas the hospital has had difficulty in providing



medical coverage for its emergency room on a 24-hour, seven-days-a-week basis; and

"Whereas, if the hospital cannot get enough doctors to cover it, it will have to close its emergency department for part of the 24-hour period—the nearest emergency departments are 40 to 60 minutes' driving distance away,

"We, the residents of the hospital's serviced areas, need 24-hour emergency coverage and call on the Ministry of Health and the Ontario Medical Association to resolve this critical issue of medical coverage of rural emergency departments immediately.

"We have attached our name and signature to this petition." I have as well.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** I have a petition to put in today.

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time to pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

#### TUITION FEES

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the NDP has hiked tuition 42% since taking office; and

"Whereas the 20% increase announced this year is the largest tuition increase in history; and

"Whereas the Premier has commented that the enormous tuition increases are simply bringing tuition levels back to the same level as they were in 1967; and

"Whereas unemployment levels for young people were at 3.6% in 1967 but today in 1994 are over 19%; and

"Whereas the NDP government has singled out young people as the only group to face record tax increases this year;"—so far—"and

"Whereas Mike Harris and the Conservatives have been silent about the unprecedented tax hike that this tuition increase amounts to; and

"Whereas Mike Harris and the Conservatives have been silent about the plight facing the young people facing the worst economic circumstances since the 1930s,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to overturn the unfair 20% increase in tuition the NDP has instituted this year."

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** Lyn may raise the tuition fees higher.

**Mr Murphy:** It's clear that the Treasurer can't take the truth. I affix my signature and support and I hope the Treasurer will too.

#### GARY WALKER

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have a petition dealing with a very emotional issue in my riding addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly to encourage the classification of Gary Walker, convicted paedophile, as a dangerous sex offender."

Over 700 residents have affixed their signatures, and I sign the petition as well, indicating my support.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Peter North (Elgin):** I have a petition here signed by more than 450 people in the Elgin county area. It's to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and may include sadomasochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all such references should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

#### CANCER TREATMENT

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly urge the Minister of Health to respond forthwith to issues raised in the Liberal task force on cancer care, including the urgent needs for radiation equipment, addressing shortages in trained personnel and providing adequate information and non-medical services for patients."

I have affixed my signature to this petition and heartily concur with it.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** I have a number of petitions here signed by people in my riding. It reads as follows: It's addressed to the Honourable

Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 55," the bill of Mr Cousens, the Progressive Conservative member, "will make it illegal, with fines of up to \$50,000, for people to make any public statement, written or oral, which ridicules, demeans or discriminates against a person on the grounds of sexual orientation, still undefined. This is a grave threat to free speech in a democratic society.

"Bill 55 is also an attack on freedom of religion, against historical Christianity, which does not condone homosexuality.

"We want to maintain our basic right to disagree with homosexuality. Some homosexuals are no longer content to express their ideas but are demanding that contrary views be suppressed with stiff penalties.

"At the same time, these special-interest groups will be allowed to teach their controversial alternative lifestyles to youngsters in the classrooms, thereby proselytizing children with their viewpoints without allowing for differing opinions.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Mr Cousens's Bill 55."

It's signed by a number of people in my riding.

#### HEALTH PROTECTION LEGISLATION

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition with 81 signatures addressed to the Legislative Assembly.

"We, the undersigned, support Bill 89, An Act to amend the Health Protection and Promotion Act.

"As currently written, should we help someone in distress, and as a consequence, we suspect that we may be exposed to a disabling, communicable disease, nothing in the Health Protection and Promotion Act will compel the doctor or the hospital to disclose to us the exposure to the disabling, communicable disease.

"We, the undersigned, have a vested interest in the disclosure of the exposure to disabling communicable disease. Bill 89 will allow the citizens of Ontario and our emergency services."

I've signed this document.

#### SNOW REMOVAL

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** "We, the undersigned, petition the St Lawrence Parks Commission to continue snow removal through the St Lawrence Parkway to ensure public access for winter recreational activity.

"We feel the commission's decision to construct a gate, lock the gate and neglect snow removal is an outright infringement of the rights of the taxpayers, residents, fishing licensees and owners of seasonal park passes.

"With the intended lockout, many of us will not enjoy cross-country skiing, ice fishing, tobogganing, walking or simply a Sunday drive through the park. The decision to lock out affects each and every one of us on a personal level and we strongly protest."

That's signed by 782 residents of my riding and I've also affixed my signature.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly which reads as follows:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH"—meaning the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters—"advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the costs of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearm owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I have signed my name to this petition.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mrs Marland from the standing committee on government agencies presented the committee's 18th report.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Does the member wish to make a brief statement?

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** No, I do not have any brief statement to make.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to standing order 106(g)11, the report is deemed to be adopted by the House.

1510

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Ms Haeck from the standing committee on regulations and private bills presented the committee's report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr71, An Act respecting The Capitol Theatre and Arts Centre (Windsor)

Bill Pr93, An Act to revive North Toronto Christian School (Interdenominational)

Bill Pr99, An Act to revive Eden Community House of Toronto.

Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill Pr95, An Act respecting the City of Kitchener.

Your committee further recommends that the fees, and the actual cost of printing at all stages and in the annual statutes, be remitted on Bill Pr71, An Act respecting The Capitol Theatre and Arts Centre (Windsor); Bill Pr93, An Act to revive North Toronto Christian School (Interdenominational); and Bill Pr99, An Act to revive Eden Community House of Toronto.



## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### AVIAN EMBLEM ACT, 1994

#### LOI DE 1994 SUR L'EMBLÈME AVIEN

On motion by Ms Murdock, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 147, An Act to designate an Avian Emblem for Ontario / Projet de loi 147, Loi désignant l'emblème avien de l'Ontario.

**Ms Sharon Murdock (Sudbury):** The loon is considered to be the bird of Ontario. It is still not official despite the fact that a boy from near Sudbury won a prize under the Liberal government for naming the bird. I am very, very pleased to be bringing this bill forward.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON AND FRENCH-LANGUAGE SCHOOL BOARDS STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

#### LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT DES LOIS CONCERNANT LA MUNICIPALITÉ RÉGIONALE D'OTTAWA-CARLETON ET LES CONSEILS SCOLAIRES DE LANGUE FRANÇAISE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 143, An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and to amend the Education Act in respect of French-Language School Boards / Projet de loi 143, Loi modifiant certaines lois relatives à la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et la Loi sur l'éducation en ce qui a trait aux conseils scolaires de langue française.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** When we left off, the honourable member for Don Mills had completed his remarks, but we did not have time for questions and/or comments. That time is now available. Are there any questions and/or comments related to the speech by the member for Don Mills? If not, we resume the rotation and I recognize the honourable member for Ottawa Centre, the Minister of Housing.

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** I'm pleased to support Bill 143. I've followed the debate that's going on in second reading with a great deal of interest, and it's been quite a debate. We've heard about democracy, we've heard about representation by population, about tradition, about community policing, about costs, about taxes and about what the people of Ottawa-Carleton think about all of those things.

It is, for those of us who are so proud that we're so fortunate to live in Ottawa-Carleton, a gripping and even a moving event. I'm more than pleased to participate in the debate; I'm delighted.

Before I offer what I think and hope may be some helpful comments on the contents of the bill, I'd like to take a few moments to remind members and the public of what our government has said it would do and what it has done to respond to the public demand for change to local government structures in Ottawa-Carleton.

A few weeks after our government was elected in the fall of 1990, the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, Dave Cooke, announced the government would provide for the election of the chair of regional council by the public, provide for a report by a commissioner delegated to

consult the public about the role and structure of regional government in Ottawa-Carleton, introduce legislation to reform regional government by 1993, consider the many public requests for changes to Ottawa-Carleton's school boards and implement regional government reforms in time for the 1994 municipal elections. These were the things that our government said it would do and the time lines that were promised.

The government has done and is doing what it promised and more. It not only commissioned and reviewed recommendations by Graeme Kirby concerning the role and structure of regional government; it also commissioned and is acting on a thorough consultation undertaken by Brian Bourns on how school boards in Ottawa-Carleton should change.

I'm personally very proud of the energy and commitment which our government has demonstrated and continues to demonstrate, to the keen interest of people in Ottawa-Carleton, about the state of their civic structures. People in Ottawa-Carleton care very much about their local governments and their school boards. These people are well educated and well informed and they want their local structures to adapt to the times and to their needs.

As I followed the debate that's been going on, I was struck by the fact that many opposition members have deluded themselves into underestimating the intelligence and the wit of the people who live in Ottawa-Carleton. Let me make it clear that I'm not challenging the fact that they actually have a low opinion of public intelligence in Ottawa-Carleton. I think their low opinion is sincerely held and I think it's wrong.

We have heard, for example, about how people in Ottawa-Carleton aren't ready for a regional police service, as if residents were somehow not quite grown-up enough, or, if they are mature enough to understand that the fourth-largest urban centre in Canada needs an integrated police service, they're still not mature enough to accept the integrated costs for that service. You'd actually be led to believe by these opposition members that the family which resides in Goulbourn and whose members work, attend schools and enjoy recreational and cultural activities all over the region didn't know that it received police services—pardon me, Mr Speaker. I will have to pause.

**The Speaker:** Stop the clock for a minute.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Perhaps I could use this moment to respond to what's been said so far. Is that in order?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I can't go on, I don't think.  
1520

**The Speaker:** If the member believes that she would be able to continue in a few minutes, fine. Otherwise, perhaps what we would do is to continue with the rotation and, with the consent of the House, allow the member to complete her allotted time in the rotation. That would require the cooperation of the entire House. Is that agreeable to the member?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreeable to the House? Agreed.

**Mr Robert Chiarelli (Ottawa West):** I'm pleased to participate in this debate on the Ottawa-Carleton government legislation. I think the process we have seen with respect to this legislation is a great example of why there is so much cynicism with the members of the public. Certainly, there is a lot of cynicism in the Ottawa-Carleton area with respect to the process of how this matter is hopefully coming to some kind of a conclusion.

But before I get into my speech, I do want to make an announcement, that the government House leader has today announced that after the second reading vote this bill will be going to a standing committee of the Legislature and the people of Ottawa-Carleton and the elected officials of Ottawa-Carleton will have an opportunity to speak to this bill, particularly in its changed form, because we had what was called Bill 77 and, all of a sudden, out of the blue, we had Bill 143, which had some very significant changes, particularly with respect to the school boards. It's only fair that the public in Ottawa-Carleton will have an opportunity at committee to comment on that.

But getting back to my point on cynicism, if we look at the chronology of events for this particular legislation, it goes back to 1987, when indeed my colleague Mr Grandmaître was the Minister of Municipal Affairs starting the original Bartlett study which culminated in two reports, being the Bartlett reports. We then went to legislation which was introduced by Mr Sweeney, who was the minister following Mr Grandmaître. The bill was introduced and it did have a lot of public support, media support and support from elected representatives.

That is how the system was supposed to work. Unfortunately, an election intervened and we then had to deal with the antics and the process of this government, the NDP government. Notwithstanding the Graham report near the end of our term, which was very well accepted by the community in Ottawa-Carleton, the NDP government decided to shelve any dealing with regional reform except to pass a bill dealing with election of the regional chair in Ottawa-Carleton.

We then get into the introduction or non-introduction of Bill 77. What happened is that a bill was prepared. It was circulated but not introduced. In May 1993, Evelyn Gigantes, the minister from Ottawa-Centre, the regional minister, attended with the mayors and the MPPs from Ottawa-Carleton. This is back in May. The timing and the process were discussed at great length. At that time, the minister undertook to have first reading by the end of June and to have second and third reading and committee proceedings completed in September or October.

Indeed, throughout 1993 the government did almost nothing. It let this problem fester and fester and fester. Indeed, it dragged it right down to the last week of the Legislature when the government House leader told the regional minister of Ottawa-Carleton, as though he was chastising a school child, a kindergarten student: "No, you may not have your bill. We don't have time." Why was the bill not introduced for second reading in September or October, as she had undertaken? Why did it not go to committee so the people of Ottawa-Carleton could have their say in the normal course?

By way of comparison, I bring your attention to December 1992. There was a bill, the market value assessment bill dealing with Metropolitan Toronto, which I'm sure you will recall, that was particular to the Toronto area. The government provided day after day of debate on second reading. It made special provisions for committee hearings in December 1992. It then came back and debated the bill again and ended up withdrawing the bill.

The government gave due attention to an issue that was very important to Metropolitan Toronto. When it came to a bill that is the most important bill in the history of Ottawa-Carleton in 25 years, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the government House leader and the regional minister from Ottawa-Carleton could not get even one hour of debate in this Legislature to meet the deadline for the end of 1993. That is unacceptable. Indeed, I think it is very insulting to the people in Ottawa-Carleton to have such a low priority for the most important bill in the history of the region.

You will know that municipal politicians, potential candidates, have to start planning for their election or re-election; 1994 is a municipal election year in Ontario and the candidates and potential candidates and the public in Ottawa-Carleton don't know what legislation they're going to be operating under in an election year. That is inexcusable. It is inexcusable because the minister from Ottawa Centre admitted quite candidly in May 1993 that it was essential to have this legislation approved and passed by the end of the year, and that did not happen.

We've heard a lot about opposition delay and opposition threats of filibuster in this particular process, the region of Carleton reform legislation. I am not going to filibuster. I don't recommend filibustering on this type of legislation, but I can certainly understand the feelings of the member for Nepean, Mr Daigeler, and other members from Ottawa-Carleton who have had no opportunity to move amendments. They were basically told they weren't going to have an opportunity to move amendments or to discuss compromises in the legislation, and this legislation is very important to all members in Ottawa-Carleton.

This bill has split the Ottawa-Carleton area almost down the middle. We have the urban area, the city of Ottawa, which represents some 45% or 46% of the population, which are of one mind, and outside we have the suburban municipalities, which are of a different mind on a number of these issues. The art of governing would have been for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the local regional minister, Evelyn Gigantes, to try to bring these people together and work out a compromise, a compromise that maybe would not be perfect but would be some kind of an accommodation to keep this community from splitting.

When you look at the efforts, the lobbying, if you will, of the regional mayors, Nicholds from Kanata and Franklin from Nepean and Cain from Gloucester, they've acted very responsibly. They've prepared briefs, they've negotiated with local MPPs, they've negotiated with the minister. Essentially, they've had the door slammed in their face in terms of reasonable discussion and compromise. The two ministers, the Minister of Municipal



Affairs and the minister from Ottawa Centre, have basically said, "It's our way or the doorway."

We have a strong community in Ottawa-Carleton—the suburban communities and the urban communities—and rather than bringing these people together, these two ministers have torn them apart. That's a sad, sad commentary on how this government does business.

We do have differences. Indeed, we have differences on the opposition benches. My riding is totally within the Ottawa urban area, which wants one type of reform. Mr Daigeler, for example, from Nepean, is totally outside of Ottawa and his mayor, his council and his public want something different. We want an opportunity in the process of this Legislature to debate the issue, to put alternatives on the table and to try to come to some reasonable compromise. To date we haven't had that opportunity. Indeed, before this government even called Bill 77 for second reading, it shut us down. In May, June and July 1993 both these ministers said, "We will bring the bill forward" if they had a commitment from the opposition to give it one hour of debate.

1530

Referring back to the Metro Toronto market value bill, they had hours of debate and they had special committee hearings just before the break at Christmas 1992. These two ministers and this government have basically said to the 650,000 people in Ottawa-Carleton, "For the most important bill in your history, we'll give you an hour's debate." That is absolutely unacceptable.

There is some relief offered today, because they realize on the government side that the opposition is serious. They have said they're going to send what is now referred to as Bill 143, the Ottawa-Carleton government bill, to a standing committee for some public hearings. That is welcome, but it should have been done last September and October when it would not have created so much confusion and consternation on the part of the people and the elected representatives of Ottawa-Carleton.

As I said originally, we have different opinions in Ottawa-Carleton. The community is split down the middle. You have the suburban mayors and communities on the one side and you have the urban area, Ottawa, on the other side. The minister from Ottawa Centre is obviously taking the urban side and she is promoting Bill 77, which essentially has the full support of the city of Ottawa and of all the community associations in the city of Ottawa.

I want to refer to one item that has relevance to last December when it became obvious that this government was mismanaging the issue of Ottawa-Carleton review. I want to refer to a news release which was issued on December 9 by MPP Dalton McGuinty and myself and I'm going to quote some extracts from it:

"Ottawa South MPP Dalton McGuinty and Ottawa West MPP Bob Chiarelli have urged the NDP government to pass the regional reform bill"—it was then Bill 77—"into law before the current session of the Legislature ends next week." That was the government's own self-imposed deadline.

"If it appears a filibuster is imminent, both MPPs want

the government to force a vote through use of a time allocation motion." That did not take place and the fact that it didn't take place caused a lot of confusion and is still causing confusion technically, politically and with the public in Ottawa-Carleton.

"The two MPPs are also urging the government to approve a compromise amendment which would give mayors of municipalities with a population over 35,000 (Ottawa, Nepean, Gloucester, Cumberland, Kanata) a full seat and vote on regional council while the smaller municipalities (Goulbourn, Osgood, Rideau, West Carleton, Vanier, Rockcliffe Park) would have a full seat, but no vote."

"Chiarelli and McGuinty say that passage of Bill 77 (second and third reading), with a compromise on the inclusion of regional mayors, is a practical and reasonable way to approve the bill before the Christmas recess, with time allocation, if necessary."

We were trying to come up with a reasonable compromise to accommodate the concerns of proportional representation so that small communities of 10,000 or 20,000 population don't have the same vote as the city of Ottawa, for example, but there was a sense that there is a place for the mayors to be at the table. That suggestion, that recommendation, was not accepted in the least by the government House leader, by the Minister of Municipal Affairs or by the minister from Ottawa Centre. Indeed, they left the impression with the people of Ottawa-Carleton that the bill was dead and they blamed the opposition.

First, the government did not bring the bill forward, when there was an undertaking from Evelyn Gigantes to do so. Secondly, they had opposition members who were willing to amend or breach the rules of this House, in a sense, by time allocation in order to get it through with a compromise.

I certainly took exception last week to the Minister of Municipal Affairs saying that opposition members support Bill 77, referring to myself and Mr McGuinty. I certainly do not support Bill 77 in its present form. I want to move amendments to it, which I will do if I get the opportunity, and if those amendments are not passed, I will reluctantly vote for Bill 77, because as I said this process started in 1987 and it's still not complete. The people in Ottawa-Carleton are justifiably cynical with their elected officials in not having brought this issue of regional reform to a conclusion.

I mentioned that, coming from an Ottawa riding completely within the city of Ottawa, I pay attention to what my constituents tell me. I want to refer to a letter—I'm actually going to quote the letter and get it on record—from the Federation of Citizens' Associations of Ottawa-Carleton. Before I do so, I want to read into the record the names of the 25 community associations whose umbrella association is indeed supporting Bill 77, or Bill 143, as it is now called. This is in anticipation of some of my colleagues in the opposition who will refer to comments from community associations outside the urban area.

The associations under the FCA umbrella include Action Sandy Hill, Britannia Park Coalition, Britannia

Ratepayers Association, Carlingwood Action Committee, Carlingwood Community Association, Centretown Citizens Community Association, Champlain Park Community Association, Civic Hospital Area Neighbourhood Association, Federation of Ottawa-Carleton Tenants Associations, Glabar Park Community Association, Glebe Community Association, Hampton-Iona Community Group, Hintonburg Community Association, King Edward Area Task Force, Lowertown West Community Association, Manor Park Community Association, New Edinburgh Community Alliance, Ottawa East Community Association, Ottawa South Community Association, Overbrook Community Council, Riverside Park Community Association, Sheffield Glen Community Association, Uppertown Community Association, West Wellington Community Association and the Woodpark Community Association. Some of these associations are in my riding of Ottawa West; others are across the urban area of Ottawa.

The FCA wrote a letter to Ottawa-Carleton members and copied the government and other MPPs. It goes as follows:

"As you know, the Federation of Citizens' Associations of Ottawa-Carleton Inc (FCA) is an umbrella organization composed of approximately 25 community associations in Ottawa.

"FCA has taken an active and consistent interest in the reform of municipal government in Ottawa-Carleton for a number of years. Our direct involvement began with the presentation of an oral commentary to the Ottawa-Carleton Liberal caucus on November 3, 1989, on Chairman David W. Bartlett's phase 1 report on regional review entitled Accountability and Representation. A written brief summarizing the recommendations made by FCA during that meeting is attached for your information.

"FCA also presented a brief to Ottawa-Carleton electoral boundaries commissioner Katherine A. Graham in September 1990 and made a written submission to Ottawa-Carleton regional review commissioner Graeme Kirby in October 1992. We have also made written representations to successive ministers of Municipal Affairs urging them to proceed quickly with democratic reforms.

"The first recommendation made by FCA in 1989—direct election of the regional chair—has already been implemented. The other recommendations we made in 1989 are remarkably similar to the legislative reforms proposed by the provincial government in Bill 77. It is also worth noting that the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade, which has a very different constituency from FCA, adopted recommendations in 1989 very similar to those made by FCA, and quite independently of FCA."

By way of an aside, I will indicate that the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade is still very strongly in support of the bill that is before the Legislature at the present time.

1540

The letter goes on:

"FCA regards Bill 77 as Ottawa-Carleton's best and last hope for the long-overdue reform of municipal

government in our region before the end of the century. Accordingly, Bill 77 has our full support.

"The reasons we gave in the attached brief for the recommendations we made in 1989 are no less valid today. Furthermore, our brief anticipated the present opposition of the local mayors (with one notable exception) to their removal from regional council as ex officio members."

The letter goes on, without my reading the whole letter, to say that the FCA prefers and recommends that the mayors not be members of regional council.

They go on to point out as well that they have had subsequent discussions with Mr Bartlett, who wrote the original report, who recommended that the mayors be on. Mr Bartlett confirmed indeed in writing to the FCA that he would support at this time the mayors not being on regional council.

Now, having read that, and having put on record the feelings of my constituents and the 25 associations in the urban Ottawa area, I still think there is room for compromise for the mayors to be on regional council. The reason I'm saying that is because there is strong division in the Ottawa-Carleton area, and I believe we, as elected representatives, should make every effort to accommodate that.

In the news release which Mr McGuinty and I issued in December, we suggested that the mayors from the larger municipalities, those with populations over 35,000, be given a full seat with a vote on regional council. That will distort slightly representation by population, but the concept of representation by population still is very significantly improved in this bill over what it is at the present time with the mayors all being on and all having full votes.

The other part of that amendment is that those mayors from municipalities with populations below 35,000 would sit at the table as ex officio members but have no vote. They would bring to regional council the prestige of their office, the knowledge base they have on current affairs and perhaps a different perspective than a directly elected councillor from that municipality who sits on regional council.

Madam Speaker, if you can imagine a city such as Nepean or Kanata or Gloucester, you have a mayor's office, you have the authority of the mayor's office, and you have corporations, businesses, that come wanting to do business, to start businesses in that particular community. They rightly go to the mayor's office and talk to the mayor with proposals for action to create jobs, to create development in a particular community.

A lot of these issues require decision-making at the regional level, as well as in the area municipality or the local level. Can you imagine a mayor, having negotiated over a period of months or indeed years with a corporation that wants to settle in their municipality, if it involves some kind of a development or decision at the regional level, being told that under present Bill 77 or 143 you cannot be at the regional table, that you've got to work a tag team match with your elected regional councillor?



I think that undermines the position of the mayor in the area municipality, so I want the opportunity, and I've wanted the opportunity all along, to move an amendment to try to bridge that gap, to try to come up with a compromise solution so that the mayors are not unduly compromised and so that those area municipalities are not unduly compromised.

If that amendment is not approved or passed, I have an alternative amendment which I want. That is, at the very least, to have all the mayors sit on regional council as non-voting members, for the same reason I just enunciated. Again, I think that will go some way to bridging the gap that is splitting the community at the present time.

We haven't had the opportunity. We've been told by this government time and time again in 1993: "The opposition is holding up this legislation. We will bring it forward when we get a commitment from the opposition that it will be debated and passed in one hour." That is not acceptable, and quite frankly it bridges on being an insult to this Legislature and an insult to the people of Ottawa-Carleton, to have the opposition, and indeed the elected representatives, manhandled by this government in that manner.

The other amendment I want the opportunity to present has to do with the transferring of economic authority for land development to the upper-tier government, to the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. I agree with the principle that this should occur. However, the regional municipality and the area municipalities should have the flexibility to vary that by agreement. In other words, my amendment that I want to propose with respect to that economic power would make it possible for an area municipality to apply to the regional municipality for approval to do the land development or economic development that is now being taken away from the authority at the local level.

If it makes sense for the upper tier to delegate that authority in a particular case to the area municipality, it should have the authority to do so. They don't have it under this legislation. Why not? If it fits in with the economic policies of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and it's going to be more efficient or effective to do so, why not have the region say to the city of Nepean or the city of Gloucester or the city of Kanata or Cumberland: "Yes, you've applied. We've looked at it. It makes sense for you to do it." You do some sort of a development agreement and say: "Good luck. If you need any help, we'll help you along with it." Right now, that is not contemplated in this legislation, and I think in a sense it handcuffs and puts a straitjacket on the flexibility in the region. I do want the opportunity to move that amendment so that flexibility will exist.

I'm nearing the end of my time. I want to say once again that I think the NDP government has done a great disservice to the people of Ottawa-Carleton by delaying introducing this legislation, with the NDP threatening the opposition by saying, "It will not come forward unless you have one hour of debate," and I think that debases the process.

In conclusion, in my last minute or minute and a half, we've been talking about ministers of Municipal Affairs

and we're talking in some respects about the disservice that the current minister has done. But I do want to take this opportunity to say that the former minister, one of my colleagues sitting beside me, this Friday is celebrating his 25th anniversary in public office. We are having a big celebration in Ottawa for the former Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I want to say that the issues that he dealt with as minister were dealt with very professionally, efficiently. As I mentioned, he started the Bartlett report, phase 1, phase 2; we had terrific public consultation; Mr Sweeney became the minister; the legislation was introduced and it was a done deal, but unfortunately the election intervened and we got back to this very, very bad process that we've seen at the present time, and confusion.

With those comments, I thank you very much, and we certainly look forward to committee hearings and the opportunity for presenting amendments to this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Questions or comments on the member's presentation?

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** I just wonder if, from the member across the way, that was a paid advertisement on the part of the Liberal riding association of Ottawa Centre or whatever riding it was.

I would also say that I think the process that was started by the former minister was being somewhat grossly exaggerated on the part of what the effect was, because part of the problem is that it didn't go away with what the former minister had tried to do.

1550

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** The member across the House here obviously doesn't know very much about either Ottawa-Carleton or eastern Ontario. I can assure him that the member for Ottawa East does not need any kind of advertising to be re-elected. To set the record straight, and I want to join the member for Ottawa West, who has spoken and congratulated the member for Ottawa East on his 25 years of service, I certainly want to add my congratulation to that as well.

But with regard to what the member for Ottawa West has said, I think very clearly he pointed out that there are different opinions. However, he insisted—and I'm very glad the way he has done this—that we in Ottawa-Carleton were and are prepared to work things out, that we are prepared to sit down and through consensus, and not through coercion, work things out, arrive at a compromise position that reflects the needs and the concerns of all the people and of all the municipalities in Ottawa-Carleton, including my own city of Nepean. I think that's what the member for Ottawa West has very clearly said, that the Liberal approach is to work through consensus and through cooperation, even if it takes some time—I admit that—and effort to work on a compromise that people can live with and not just, like the NDP, like this government, is doing, to its disgrace and to its shame, pushing one side of the equation and only the Ottawa side.

I'll be getting an opportunity very, very shortly to speak to that, but I want to say I was pleased that the member for Ottawa West, even though he takes a differ-

ent position than I do on the bill itself, emphasized very, very correctly that we in Nepean as well, and in the other suburban municipalities, are ready to make our contribution to the regional government in Ottawa-Carleton through compromise and not through coercion.

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** The member for Ottawa West apparently at one point had a proposal whereby some of the mayors would serve on the regional council and have a vote and other mayors would serve on the regional council but not have a vote. I believe the member for Ottawa West has withdrawn that proposal. That was a suggestion, I guess, at one time perhaps, but if he has withdrawn it, I'm pleased that he has and recognizes that that kind of solution would not work, that you cannot have a member, a mayor, sitting on a council without a vote. That member would be what they call a lame-duck member, would have no influence and would really not be in the mainstream of the decision-making on the regional council. Perhaps it was put forward in the spirit of cooperation in reaching a solution, but I'm afraid that it would be doomed to failure.

I think what's being proposed now by the members on this side, and what we proposed all along, that the mayors be full-fledged members of this regional council, will give that liaison between the local councils and the regional council. I hope the government is listening to the message, because if you want to have local government work, then there needs to be cooperation between the regional and the local councils, and the only way that that's going to work is to have the mayors serve on both levels, because they will provide that working relationship.

There are other problems beyond that that need to be addressed, because, as we know, there are concerns with regard to the policing situation, with regard to the cost. I hope the government will hold public hearings, will listen to these concerns in the Ottawa-Carleton region. Yes, there's been some consultation through various studies, but this particular proposal has not been put to the people in the Ottawa-Carleton region, and that can only be done through public hearings.

**The Acting Speaker:** We have time for one more question or comment.

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** Several times during the speech, and even with the questions or comments, I heard about the Liberal approach. The Liberal approach, in my opinion—oh, and by the way, happy birthday to the member for Ottawa East.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** It's an anniversary, George: 25th anniversary in politics.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Anniversary? Sorry, I thought it was a birthday.

The Liberal approach has always been—and my speeches after a speech like that and my questions after a speech like that are becoming very repetitive in this place—the Liberal approach for four years has been to bash, scratch, punch, to kick, to scream, to do anything to distract people from the issues. This is no different. This bill here, Bill 143, is no different than any other bill. Your approach and your comments have done nothing but

try to discredit the government for what it's doing. Why don't you talk about the positive things that the bill has done?

**Mr Bisson:** That's why they're the opposition.

**Mr Mammoliti:** That's a valid point. However, you can be effective in opposition by giving constructive criticism, by giving suggestions on how to do it a little better and not just standing up here continually for four years and doing nothing but bash every single bill that comes forward in this place.

Some of you might be taking offence at this, and quite frankly I am quite sick of standing up and pointing this out to you continually for four years. Bill 143, again, is no different than any other bill. Talk about the positives for a change. Talk about the policing in the community, that the community has continually wanted changes, and wanted the changes that this is going to provide. Talk about the positives. Talk about the positives when it comes to bringing local governments together—

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. The member's time has expired.

**Mr Mammoliti:** —and running them a little differently, a little more appropriately. Talk about the positives for a change.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Ottawa West has two minutes to respond.

**Mr Chiarelli:** First of all, with respect to the comments of the member for Don Mills, he may not be aware of the fact that the suburban mayors came up with a compromise for the mayors to sit on regional council, and indeed the mayors themselves agreed that the village of Rockcliffe Park would sit on council without a vote. It's that principle that I was talking about in saying that the smaller municipalities, not only Rockcliffe but the other ones that I mentioned, could conceivably sit on council without a vote. The principle itself has been endorsed by the suburban mayors.

With respect to the comments of the member for Yorkview, I can only ask one simple question: Why was Bill 77 not put on the order paper and called in 1993? The only answer that has been given is that the opposition was threatening a filibuster. If every time the opposition threatened something, the government withdrew its legislation, there would be nothing going on in here. That really was a very, very silly response.

It didn't bring it forward because it didn't have the clout, it didn't have the commitment that the member for Yorkview had as a member from the Metropolitan Toronto area when the market value assessment bill came forward in December 1992. It was given very high priority, it was debated at length in this Legislature, they made special arrangements for committee hearings and, indeed, the government ended up withdrawing it. But the way that bill was dealt with was very different from the Ottawa-Carleton bill, because this minister has no clout in this government.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate? The Minister of Housing and member for Ottawa Centre.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Could I please take a moment to express my thanks to my colleagues on both sides of the



House for permitting me to rejoin the debate, having so rudely interrupted myself in the first case through coughing.

It's a temptation to get into trying to respond directly to the member for Ottawa West. I'm pleased to know that he has indicated his willingness to support Bill 143, as I am doing.

I was drawing to the attention of members the fact that people in Ottawa-Carleton are not only mature enough to understand the need for an integrated police force as one item contained within this bill but also mature enough to understand that you have to have an integrated method of paying for police services, and they are quite prepared to do that.

1600

We've heard from opposition members that people in Ottawa-Carleton are a bit quaint about how they do business. My favourite contribution during the debate we've heard on this subject of business was from the member representing Carleton, speaking on March 24.

I'm going to quote a little. He said:

"I don't argue with the fact that the region should be given this overall power to control economic development. But the bill doesn't allow them to say to the city of Nepean or the city of Kanata, 'We don't mind if you set up an industrial park out in your area, as long as'—you know, they may put some conditions on that; for instance, 'You all have to sell for a certain price,' or, 'Nobody can outbid another one.' But why on earth do we say in a bill: 'You can't do this. You can't delegate part of that particular duty or that obligation or that function'"—again, he's talking economic development—"to the local municipality'?"

"We're not so concerned with who owns the land; we're concerned with the principle of developing the whole area in some coordinated fashion. If that can be achieved and allow flexibility, why not do it? Why not allow flexibility?" he asks.

"The minister is not cutting off existing industrial parks which do exist. They are grandfathered into this bill. But I can't for the life of me understand why you want to have somebody come to the city of Ottawa or the city of Kanata, into the mayor's office and say, 'Look, I want to invest some money; I want to create some jobs in your community,' and the mayor of the city of Kanata is going to say: 'Sorry, I can't help you. I don't have anything to do with economic development. You're going to have to talk to the region.'

"The region's about 10 miles away, 12 miles away from the city of Kanata. That's not a long way to go, but doesn't this work contradictory to the whole idea of allowing the local mayor her due? Merle Nicholds, who is the mayor of the city of Kanata, has done more to try to convince this minister that he's going down the wrong track than anybody I know. Claudette Cain, the mayor of Gloucester, has been another leader in terms of dealing with that.

"These are good people. The 12 mayors"—last time I looked, there were 11—"I know, have their hearts all in the right place, and boy, when an investor comes through

their door they want to get hold of that investor and say, 'Come on, let's walk out and have a look at a piece of property that the city owns,' or whatever. I don't understand why we can't delegate some of this down to the municipal level and allow the regional municipality to do that, if it so wishes, at a regional government meeting."

How's that for a description? That's what the member for Carleton thinks is an appropriate way to do economic planning in Ottawa-Carleton. It was good enough in the good old days and it should be good enough for ever, because, you know, people in Ottawa-Carleton are kind of quaint about how they like to do business.

We don't like to talk about sector partnerships or regional economic planning and all that modern international competition stuff. Let's just go out and see if our mayor here can fix you up with your land size needs and then we'll go down to the regional council and get it to tidy up the details, and that's how it should be done, according to the member for Carleton.

The passion of some members opposite for the old ways of doing things is pretty awe-inspiring. From my point of view, it warps their vision. It makes them believe that people in Ottawa-Carleton are like them, afraid of change, afraid of new ways of doing things.

Let me quote a bit from the member for Ottawa-Rideau contributing to the debate on March 28. She said:

"Bill 143 provides no direct link between regional government and local municipalities. This is indeed a major, major change, and I consider it a major, major error and weakness, a major change in accountability, a major change in cost controls, a major change in equitable distribution of economic development across the municipalities, a major shift in our community and its patterns, traditions and history."

This is a statement from the member for Ottawa-Rideau that exhibits an enormous resistance to positive change, and then it projects that same resistance and timorousness on to the population of Ottawa-Carleton. I have no reason to believe the member for Ottawa-Rideau is not in earnest in her resistance to change, but I deeply and firmly believe she's mistaken when she projects that resistance onto the population of Ottawa-Carleton.

What is the change that she and others fear most? Now we get to the heart of the matter. It's the structure of the proposed new regional council. What is it about the proposed structure which is new? Not the directly elected representation; not the proposal for directly elected regional councillors, who would represent regional wards which cut across local municipal boundaries. That was contained in the Liberal 1990 bill. So it's not the proposed new, directly elected, multimunicipal council representatives who are exciting the fear and loathing in some members opposite. It's the fact that they will be regional councillors who will represent their regional wards without the company of municipal mayors on that council.

This is the outrage and the shock and the scandal, the offensive, almost blasphemous proposal. This is the true crime they see in Bill 143. It proposes a council which is elected to be a regional council rather than a regional

council which represents what? The whole notion of a regional council which is directly elected to be a regional council dismays and confuses some of the members opposite.

For example, on March 24, the member for Ottawa East said:

"I represent three mayors in this bill, and those...mayors don't see eye to eye, so it's...difficult for me to stand and say, 'I'm in favour of this for Nepean or Kanata or Ottawa or Vanier.' I look at my region globally and I want to try to be as reasonable as possible."

Later in the same speech, he provided this further analysis:

"I realize what the minister is trying to say. The mayors' representation will be replaced by regional councillors, and that's fair. But I'm telling you, what Ottawa-Carleton needs is a closer link with municipal taxpayers. After all, 55% of our tax bill in Ottawa-Carleton goes for education—and it's part of this master bill, omnibus bill—and 25% of our taxes go to regional government. So I think it's very important that our mayors should sit on regional council."

I don't quite see how that works through as a thought, but if he says that's how it is, I take his word.

The member for Ottawa East continued:

"Where will the link be? Don't forget, these 19 regional councillors, these new wards, will cross municipal boundaries. I was looking at the recent map introduced by the ministry, and in my area my regional representative will be serving three mayors. How can a regional representative, a regional councillor, serve three mayors? How can he be aware of three different municipal budgets? I think it's very important that the person have the power to speak for these individual municipalities, but I find it very difficult that the role of the regional councillor.... Well, you'll have to sit on the fence because one municipality may not agree with another one. I think this is why it's so important that the mayors do sit on regional council."

I think the member for Ottawa East is earnest in his confusion, but I think he's wrong when he judges the population of Ottawa-Carleton to be in a similar state of mind. People in Ottawa-Carleton do not think regional council members should represent mayors. They think regional council members should be elected to represent the residents of Ottawa-Carleton. In fact, we've seen some evidence within the Liberal caucus. The Liberal representatives of Ottawa West, who just spoke, and Ottawa South don't seem to share this confusion of the member representing Ottawa East. They don't oppose the proposal to elect regional councillors to represent the residents of the region rather than to represent the mayors in the region. That's the huge issue here. It's amazing that it should be so, but that's the way things are. It's also the reason things should change at regional council in Ottawa-Carleton.

1610

The world has changed in the 25 years since the first regional government in Ontario was established in Ottawa-Carleton, and Ottawa-Carleton has changed. I can

attest to those changes. Between 1975 and 1981, I served two electoral terms in this Legislature representing the riding of Carleton East in the eastern part of Ottawa-Carleton. In 1975, the municipality of Gloucester was a very inward-looking municipality, very traditional in attitude, almost parochial in nature. By 1981, having experienced some years of the fastest population growth in Canada, Gloucester had become a cosmopolitan and energetic centre of new ideas and wider visions, which is probably why I didn't remain the member representing the area. Ottawa-Carleton has changed and its local government structures must now reflect that change.

It's amazing to me that some members opposite, in fact the majority of the members opposite, who have participated in this debate have tried to bolster their resistance to change with material such as a letter which many have quoted from some people who use a letterhead that reads, "Citizens for Good Government." This communication is in earnest, I believe, but it cannot earnestly lay claim to being representative, nor does it. Six signatures are attached and they do not claim to represent the organizations in which they have membership or the residents in the areas where they live.

But to hear some of the members opposite as they cite claims and statements from this communication, you might be led to think there was a mass movement fomenting in Ottawa-Carleton against Bill 143 and in particular against the proposal to establish a directly elected regional council without mayors. This is not the case, and if some members opposite believe it is the case, they are deluding themselves.

Members opposite, some of them, have used as proof of the unacceptability of a regional council without mayors a vote of the existing regional council, on which of course the existing mayors sit. Did the members opposite note that even with all mayors voting, regional council came dangerously close to supporting a regional council with no mayors? How can opposition members expect that their anxieties will be taken seriously when they use this kind of flimsy evidence?

The debate opposite now directs itself to a legislative committee travelling to Ottawa-Carleton. If a legislative committee travels to Ottawa-Carleton for hearings, the unhappy mayors will be heard by the committee. The public in Ottawa-Carleton has already heard the unhappy mayors.

At a media conference after Christmas, I spoke on behalf of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the valiant Ed Philip, to let the public of Ottawa-Carleton know that we would move legislatively this spring to provide new regional roles and structures for the local elections in 1994. One media representative asked if I didn't think more study was required, and the response from the rest of a very large group of the media was groaning laughter. The local media are in this case very much in touch with public feelings in Ottawa-Carleton on this matter.

People in Ottawa-Carleton want the changes proposed in Bill 143 and they want to use those changes to directly elect a regional council which will be directly accountable for significant areas of local responsibility: economic development, an integrated police service, environmental



protection and the \$1 billion of local taxpayers' money that's currently spent at the regional level. That's why I'm pleased to support Bill 143.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions or comments to the member?

**Mr Bernard Grandmaitre (Ottawa East):** The minister responsible for, let's say, the Ottawa-Carleton area—I don't think she's responsible for eastern Ontario—has a clear way of muddying the waters. She just loves to talk to herself, to listen to herself and to believe in herself. I find it very, very strange coming from that minister because she's always talking about consultation and compromises. On three different occasions, that minister, the Minister of Housing, made three different announcements.

Bill 77 never came to the House. Then she made a second announcement and now this is her third announcement. I don't think the government was ready and willing, didn't have the courage to introduce Bill 77 and used the opportunity to make some changes for the French-language school boards to introduce a new bill, Bill 143.

That's their real excuse for spending thousands of dollars in our local newspapers denouncing, blaming the opposition because we were delaying this legislation. We have told the minister on a number of occasions that the Ottawa-Carleton group, including the third party, wanted to work with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the minister and to listen to our options as pointed out by the member for Ottawa West. We do have options, we do have compromises, but their agenda is very different: "What you see is what you get. It's our way or the highway."

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired.

**Mr Sterling:** I want to indicate my concern over the minister, who is supposed to be a minister of the crown and representing the government, reading from Hansard and then putting her own spin on what I meant when I spoke in this Legislature, particularly about the economic development part of this bill.

I saw it, as I think the member for Ottawa West saw it in his speech, although he comes from a different point on the bill, for flexibility in this legislation, to allow municipalities to have the opportunity to be part of the overall economic development plan of the region.

I did not indicate in my speech at all that I was against the concept of having the region, in general, in charge of the overall planning of economic development in the area. Therefore, I find very objectionable the minister in her comments. I find it unbecoming of a minister. I find her comments condescending and silly.

**Mr Drummond White (Durham Centre):** I'd like to congratulate the member for Ottawa Centre for her comments and for her participation both in the debate and in, of course, the important process leading up to the completion of this legislation.

The member has shown a great deal of wisdom and breadth of experience as she reflects back upon the last 25 years on how the region of Ottawa-Carleton has changed and how it needs to continue to change. She

even reflected upon her own political career in that regard. I know she has gained a great deal of wisdom through that experience.

The focus on economic development is an important one and I'm glad the member for Carleton pointed out how important it is that economic structures and municipal structures work together for the greater economic and social benefit of our whole community, and that they are not outmoded, they're not based upon ideas and structures that might have been applicable a generation or two ago but which no longer are effective. I think the member for Ottawa Centre points out in her speech how important it is to change what might have worked in 1969 to what will work in 1994 and 1995.

1620

**The Acting Speaker:** We have time for one more question or comment.

**Mr Daigeler:** I must say I deeply resent the arrogance that is coming through from the member for Ottawa Centre. She says that we in the suburban areas are afraid of change. Earlier on, before she interrupted herself, she said that we in the opposition parties are underestimating the wit and the intelligence of the voters of Ottawa-Carleton because we are saying they can't run their own affairs through the regional police force.

Minister, I think the only thing that I may have underestimated is in fact—what I'm trying to say is not parliamentary, so I won't say it. But it refers to your own intelligence and wit, because if you are so ignorant of the position of the people in Nepean and in Gloucester, if you think that we feel we can't run our own affairs, then I wonder where you have been over the last 20 years. Thank you very much, we have run our police services in Nepean with a surplus, we have run the affairs of the city of Nepean with a surplus for a lot longer than the city of Ottawa.

I think you should have made an obligation on yourself to read the letters, to come to Nepean and find out what the people of Nepean and of the other suburban municipalities want and then you wouldn't make such outrageous statements as you made this afternoon in this House and earlier on during the debate. That is something that really shocks me, to hear this, because I know that the people have had difficulty meeting with the member for Ottawa Centre, but at least I thought she would follow the newspapers and wouldn't just read the Ottawa Citizen, that she would talk to people who are in other ridings and not just in her riding of Ottawa Centre. I find that very, very disappointing.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Ottawa Centre has two minutes to respond.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** It's clear that some opposition members didn't much enjoy being quoted back to themselves, because when you listen to the words that they actually spoke during this debate, they don't make an awful lot of sense, even to themselves.

The question has been raised about whether we have listened to people in Ottawa-Carleton. I think that the whole process that has gone on over three years in Ottawa-Carleton, including discussion of what should be

happening with our school boards, has been one in which the public of Ottawa-Carleton, from one end to the other—north, south, east and west—has had the ability to get involved, and to a large extent has involved itself. I certainly, as one member elected from that area, have talked to people from all the parts of Ottawa-Carleton affected by this bill.

It may surprise some members opposite from some of what they call suburban areas, such as Nepean, that there are people in Nepean who actually support Bill 143; I've talked to them. I've talked to people who don't support Bill 143. I've talked to the mayors. I've talked to enormous numbers of people on this subject. I can tell you that the overwhelming desire of the people in Ottawa-Carleton is to move on with this process.

We have been scolded for not having proceeded during the fall session, but that was a session during which we were being told that pieces of legislation such as the Environmental Bill of Rights would get held up if we proceeded. We were being told that it was open warfare and the opposition would resist to the last ounce of its strength, and so here we are. We are moving ahead in 1994, as we said we would. It may discomfort them but that's where we're at.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Daigeler:** It's with some sense of anticipation that I've been waiting for the opportunity, at least a little bit longer than two minutes of response time, to be able to speak to this bill that we have before us. Frankly, it's a very long time that I've been waiting for this. I will make a number of points.

To start out with, however, to speak to the supposed delay by the opposition parties with regard to this bill, I think the delay simply is due to the fact that the current Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr Philip, has seriously mishandled this whole dossier. I think that's really the problem that we're in, that this minister has mishandled this dossier.

I hope the Premier takes notice of that, if he's going to be the Premier for much longer, in his next cabinet shuffle, because I think the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs of the NDP, Mr Cooke, would have been a bit wiser and bit smarter in the way he handled these affairs. At least he was at the beginning, because way back in 1992, the minister at the time, Mr Cooke, wrote to all the members from the Ottawa-Carleton area and said: "Do you have some ideas for a person who could study the government system in Ottawa-Carleton? Give me some ideas."

I wrote back to Mr Cooke at the time, and here's what I said on April 1, 1992, two years ago:

"Further to your request for the names of possible commissioners to study municipal government in this area, I wish to state my strong opposition to the setting up of yet another costly study. Both Mr Bartlett and Katherine Graham have already completed very comprehensive reviews of the most significant issues.

"I can see the need to have some further public consultation on Miss Graham's specific proposals for regional wards. Any other studies are a waste of time and

money." Was I ever right in my comments.

"I encourage you, therefore, to build on what has been done already at considerable cost and effort by a lot of people in this area."

That was my letter of April 1, 1992.

Now, to his credit, the then Minister of Municipal Affairs at least acknowledged my letter, at least wrote back, which cannot even be said of the current Minister of Municipal Affairs, who has the discourtesy of not even responding, of not even answering letters that I have written to him, which, by the way, is very different from the Premier. Again, I hope the Premier is taking notice of this, because the Premier himself even personally responds to letters that are written to him by members of the opposition. But this current minister has sufficient disregard for the opposition members that he doesn't even respond to letters from the opposition, and never mind letters from the public.

Anyway, at least the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs responded, and on May 5, which frankly was even good timing—it didn't even take him too long to respond—he did say, "Thank you for your letter of April 1."

Here's what he said:

"You will be reassured to know that we are not undertaking another costly study of municipal government in the Ottawa-Carleton region. I agree with you that there has been sufficient research and analysis over the past five years which has resulted in a number of recommendations on some outstanding issues. What I do intend to undertake is a short and cost-effective consultation process on the outstanding issues to provide a better understanding of the degree of public support for change."

I must say, if the then minister would have stuck to what he said in this letter, I think we would not be in the most unfortunate position that we're in today, where we have municipalities and local politicians and local representatives fighting with each other on how to govern ourselves in Ottawa-Carleton. If the minister, Mr Cooke, would have stayed the minister, I think he would have had enough political acumen and political knowledge and knowhow not to follow the advice of the member for Ottawa Centre and pit one municipality against the other.

The only reason that I can see why the member for Ottawa Centre is doing that is to perhaps try and bolster her own election chances. I cannot see for the life of me any other reason why the member for Ottawa Centre would be so negligent and so forgetful of the positions of the other municipalities in the Ottawa-Carleton area. I am sure she is aware that a lot of people—not everybody, I grant you that. I would say the vast majority of the people, certainly in my municipality, certainly those who are in positions of responsibility and who have been elected by their own people, are in opposition to this proposal that is being put forward by this government.

1630

In terms of delay, I think it is simply false to say now—we're really five minutes before 12, five minutes before anything can be done, before the next municipal



election—that because we as an opposition didn't fall flat and we didn't say you can pass this whole thing without any kind of further public consultation, we are to blame.

I tell the minister and I tell the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I tell the Minister of Housing that we said two and three years ago: "Build on the work, conclude the work that the Liberal government has done and lead this thing to a conclusion. You can do it easily within a year." If they would have done that and had not tried to reinvent the wheel, I think this legislation would have been in place well in advance of the election that is coming in this fall. So don't you dare blame the opposition for any kind of delay that we are experiencing.

The key point, however, is really the support for this initiative. It's very unfortunate that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not here. However, the parliamentary assistant is here and he said earlier on, "Oh, the people in Ottawa-Carleton are in favour." Frankly, the sense of ignorance about the situation in Ottawa-Carleton that's coming through, to me, puzzles the mind. I can understand it perhaps a little bit from the parliamentary assistant because he has to follow the line, as I said earlier, that the minister is putting forward to him.

However, the member for Ottawa Centre knows full well that, for example, the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade, which is quoted by the Minister of Municipal Affairs as being in favour and therefore the people of Ottawa-Carleton are in favour, does not, and I insist, does not represent the position of, for example, the Nepean Chamber of Commerce. Frankly, after the minister spoke, I'm no longer sure whether she even knows that there is a Nepean Chamber of Commerce, a Kanata Chamber of Commerce and a Gloucester Chamber of Commerce, and that the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade essentially represents, and they have every right and reason to represent their views—I don't deny that—but they represent the position of Ottawa. Well, there is such a thing as the Nepean Chamber of Commerce, and before I point out some of the other opposition that's coming forward from my municipalities, I would just like to point out to the Minister of Housing, the member for Ottawa Centre, who is here, to indicate to her in case she hasn't read it, how the Nepean Chamber of Commerce feels about the project of the NDP government.

This is addressed to the Honourable Ed Philip:

"Dear Sir:

"The Nepean Chamber of Commerce is the acknowledged and respected voice of business in the city of Nepean. Our 430 individual and corporate members represent over 10,000 employees....

"We wrote to you last year to share our thoughts and conclusions with you regarding the Ottawa-Carleton regional review undertaken by Commissioner Kirby," and so on and so on.

"Although the bill has not yet received even second reading in the assembly, you have placed advertisements in the local press declaring the provisions of Bill 77 will be implemented forthwith."

By the way, for that advertisement the Minister of Municipal Affairs was severely chastised—I've never

heard a Speaker chastise a minister like that before—as coming extremely close to contempt of this House in the way he told the public that this matter was basically law, without any kind of discussion or debate in this House.

In any case, here's what the Nepean Chamber of Commerce says:

"The Nepean Chamber of Commerce perceives the local municipality as the cornerstone of the entire political process in Canada." Frankly, there I fully agree with my people from Nepean and I will be speaking to that later on, because that really is the core issue. It is not Big Brother or Sister, whether he or she is located in Ottawa or in Toronto or wherever, or in Ottawa in terms of the federal government, but we like to look after our own affairs and that's really the issue. I will be coming back to that a little bit later on.

The Nepean Chamber of Commerce says the local municipal government is "the level of government nearest to, most accessible to and most responsive to the needs of the electorate. So-called 'regional issues' are nothing more than simple consensus extensions reflecting a commonality of interest at the municipal level. The proposed separation of representation to create a regional council entirely isolated and divorced from local councils is regressive and not in the public interest.

"The Nepean Chamber of Commerce strongly opposes"—and I hope the minister's listening—"the proposed amalgamation of the three local police services."

This is a two-page, very detailed letter. Obviously, because I have only 30 minutes, I cannot read all of this into the record. However, it is very, very clear that the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade, when it says, "We're in favour," does not speak for the position of the Nepean Chamber of Commerce. I will let the member for Carleton East speak to the position of the Gloucester Chamber of Commerce.

It is very, very clear that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is simply misinformed, to be polite, if he says that because of the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade being in favour of this initiative, the people of Ottawa-Carleton are in favour. This is just ignorance, not knowing the difference between the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade and the other chambers of commerce in our region.

Clearly, the Minister of Housing has said the press is in favour. I say yes, if you think that the Ottawa Citizen is the press in Ottawa-Carleton. For one reason or another, and I guess that's why they're called the Ottawa Citizen and not the Ottawa-Carleton Citizen, they have taken the position that, yes, they're in favour of one-tier government. That is their position and anything less than that, frankly, for them is not even acceptable.

That's a position they can take, but it certainly is only the position of the editorial board of the Ottawa Citizen. It is not—and I say not—a position that the people in Nepean in any way, shape or form want anything to do with. I will come back to the reasons they are not in favour of it, and the reasons are not at all what the Minister of Housing thought they were.

They're not at all because of a fear of change, because

I would like to remind the member for Ottawa Centre and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who's not here right now, that we in Nepean, for example, have elected regional councillors for a lot longer than the city of Ottawa ever thought of one-tier government, and it has worked. It has worked beautifully. We have had harmony, we have moved forward together, and there's absolutely nothing that I or the people of Nepean have to take from the member for Ottawa Centre in terms of lessons, because we have made our contribution.

Andy Haydon, the regional chairman, was the previous mayor of Nepean. We have made our contributions. Certainly, our current mayor makes a very strong contribution to the regional government in Ottawa-Carleton. The chairman of the social services commission, Mr Al Loney, is from Nepean. Gord Hunter also chairs a regional committee. So anybody who says that we are parochial in Nepean because we don't want to be swallowed up by Ottawa I think is doing what the NDP normally refuses, and that is blaming the victim, because that's really what's happening here.

In Nepean, unfortunately, I would say we are only losing and we cannot see any kind of gain that is in front of us. That's precisely why in a unanimous vote, and I would like, again, this government to listen to this and to acknowledge it, the Nepean city council voted against this project. They have indicated that they are prepared to sit down and make certain adjustments, but in general what this government is trying to do by removing, for example, the mayors totally from council, by taking away the powers of the local municipalities to determine their own local wards, is totally unacceptable, certainly to the council of my municipality.

1640

Here again, and this is not the first letter that was sent to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I have a letter in front of me, December 6, 1993, which is a long letter, some five pages, with a very detailed brief attached, listing the reasons why the city of Nepean, as I say, unanimously rejected the proposals by the NDP government.

Here it is, in black and white, and I can only conclude that the Minister of Municipal Affairs failed even to read the material that was sent to him. I presume the member for Ottawa Centre is in the same boat, because she says there has been very little opposition to the provisions of the NDP government. I don't know where she has been, because there are stacks of letters that have been sent to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in opposition to the proposals that are being put forward by the NDP government.

The member for Ottawa Centre and the minister himself are making a lot about interventions that they have received from the city of Ottawa. I can understand that the city of Ottawa and the people of Ottawa itself, 300,000 people against about 110,000 in Nepean, would like the assessment and the fiscal strength that is in the city of Nepean to be swallowed up into Ottawa. Thank you very much, but that's what the people in Nepean do not want, and that's why they have written to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I have in front of me, for example, a letter from a Carleton board trustee, Alex Getty. Here's what he says, referring to the infamous ad that was published in the Ottawa Citizen by the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

"In your published letter you state that the public has indicated that the time to implement these reforms has arrived. Might I ask which public? If you mean the majority who now live outside the city of Ottawa, your statement is quite erroneous and misleading. If you mean the residents of Ottawa, then just possibly you may be right, although my sense is that many Ottawa residents neither know nor care very strongly about Bill 77.

"In stark contrast, the public voice of Nepean, at exceptionally well attended meetings at city hall, sent a very clear signal to provincial officialdom that we want no part of a Toronto-Ottawa-inspired dictate to the people of Carleton. It is the wrong move at the wrong time for all the wrong reasons and will cost taxpayers and voters an inordinate amount of new and higher taxes just to implement the bill."

Since I do not have much time, I cannot put on the record many of the other letters, even of supporters of the current NDP government, by the way. There are people who said, "We did in fact work for the member for Ottawa Centre." I have a letter from a gentleman in Nepean who for one reason or another was working for the member for Ottawa Centre. He's very, very disappointed and has written a very sharp and very negative letter to the minister, accusing her of not fulfilling her promises that she made to the NDP voters in the last election.

Again, Minister, I do hope that you read your correspondence and that you don't just have your staff answer correspondence without you being made aware of what the real feelings are of the people in Ottawa-Carleton.

But why are we so opposed to this project in Nepean and in other municipalities outside of Ottawa? The reality is that frankly, in Nepean, as I said, first of all, we have made our contribution to the region. We have had city-wide elections. People have had to run for office for regional government for the last 15 years, so we have had accountability for regional decisions. We've had that, so we don't need to take any lessons that we have to have a more accountable regional government. We have had regional councillors directly elected by our municipality. The mayor has served and has served very well on the executive committee of regional government. They have always taken the position that what benefits Ottawa-Carleton will also benefit Nepean.

So we have shown our share of responsibility for regional affairs and for the development of Ottawa-Carleton. I myself have done everything I could to help, for example, the city of Ottawa get the support of the provincial government for the life sciences technology park, because I realize that certainly that will be of benefit to the whole Ottawa-Carleton community. But what I'm saying is, we can do this, thank you very much, by sitting down and working things out. We don't need to be stripped of our powers and our ability to manage our own affairs in order to work together and to cooperate. That's my point.



The other reason why we in Nepean—again, thank you very much—are very much afraid of this draconian measure by the NDP government is that we are going to have extra costs. The minister and many other people in Ottawa are saying, “Well, this is going to save us money.” Where is it going to save us money?

Certainly, the affairs of the city of Nepean have been managed very well. The increase in the annual taxation rate has been below the rate of inflation for 10 years. We have significant resources in the city of Nepean, so the economic management of my municipality has been very good. The people of Nepean are afraid of losing that control that they’ve had over the affairs of their own municipality and are afraid of losing that excellent economic management, certainly, by removing that link from the municipal level with the regional government and by totally removing the ability of the Nepean council to designate its own worth. That’s another major reason why we feel that rather than saving us money, it’s going to cost us money.

Frankly, when we look at the example of Metro regional government, here’s what happens. I pulled out a newspaper article that appeared in the Toronto Star on March 5, 1994. Here’s what it says:

“Councillors used to serve on their respective city councils and serve at Metro [Toronto] part-time until 1988. Then provincial legislation made them full-time members directly elected to run Metro.

“The result was a huge increase in cost. The tab to support the 34 councillors and their staff jumped to \$5.2 million from \$1.5 million.... Policing costs now account for 36 cents of every property tax dollar. It is now \$537.6 million, double what it was in 1982.”

The minister and especially the citizen are saying, “Well, regional police, for example, is going to save us costs; it’s going to be more efficient.”

Again, the people of Nepean are very much afraid that they’re going to lose in terms of costs, because our police building, the headquarters of our Nepean police services, is paid for, whereas the headquarters of the Ottawa police is not paid for yet. There are debentures out there, so we are afraid that we may have to carry some of that load.

1650

Also, the people of Nepean are afraid that they’re going to lose that closeness they have with their community police. They’re afraid that the police are going to be withdrawn from some of the neighbourhood communities in Nepean and concentrated in the downtown core. I think that is a real and legitimate fear.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs has said: “Well, don’t worry too much. There’s going to be transition assistance to some of the local municipalities. Trust me; I will provide some assistance.”

Frankly, I have no trust whatsoever in the current Minister of Municipal Affairs, because he seriously let me down before. When I asked him—on a very major project for eastern Ontario that I’ve been pursuing for a long time, the Highway 416 completion—in November 1990, “Are you going to complete the 416?” Mr Philip, who was then the Minister of Transportation, said, and I

quote in Hansard here, page 2123 of November 21, 1990: “Highway 416 will be completed; it will be completed on time.... I can assure the member that the highway will be completed on time, on schedule and, indeed” it will be done.

We all know what happened in the meantime. Shortly thereafter, the NDP government withdrew its commitment and the second phase now is on indefinite hold.

So much for the promises and the commitments of this Minister of Municipal Affairs. If he says there’s going to be financial assistance available to Nepean, for example, and other suburban communities in order to ease the transition to a regional police force, frankly, I just don’t believe him because he has let me down, and he has let the people of Ottawa-Carleton down before, and so has this government.

There is one point I still want to put on the record quickly, because a lot of Ottawa people and some of the councillors of Ottawa are making the point that we ought to have representation by population. In my opinion, in Canada this is the wrong principle to follow. In Canada, and I’m proud to say, we don’t follow this principle because the people of Prince Edward Island, the people of New Brunswick, the people of Nova Scotia, the people of Newfoundland, smaller provinces, have a big say and almost as much of a say, I would say, as the province of Ontario. I don’t know about the current Premier, but certainly in past times the Premier of Ontario and the Premier of Quebec were very respectful of the positions of smaller provinces in Canada, and through cooperation worked things out. That was the traditional approach that we have had in Ottawa-Carleton, and that I fully support. I think that’s a good approach.

When I used to be on the school board, the Catholic separate school board, I represented Nepean, a municipality that’s much bigger than some of the rural areas. We had a trustee from Osgood, we had a trustee from West Carleton. They represented a lot fewer people and electors than I did, but it was very important for us to respect and to recognize the identity and the idiosyncracies of the rural people and of other municipalities. I think that is the flair and that is the special genius, I would say, of local government that we have had in Ottawa-Carleton, and I’m very, very sorry to see that going down the drain with this particular initiative of the NDP government.

If the member for Ottawa Centre does not understand that, I think it’s too bad because there is a genius to this that you can work things out. It’s a very, very dangerous road to go down in the name of efficiency, I grant you that, but sometimes efficiency comes with a terrible cost.

I take the position and I take proudly the position that I like to be governed by the government that is closest to me, and I would like it to have more power rather than less. That’s why basically I am very strongly opposed to this initiative that is coming forward from this government because it totally cuts back the powers of the local municipal government, to the benefit of the higher government.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions or comments for the member for Nepean.

**Mr Sterling:** I'm sorry to announce to the Legislature that I've just received a notice of closure on this bill, Bill 143, which the government has obviously laid down at the table. They're not going to even allow the members for Ottawa-Carleton to speak on this bill. There won't be time in the rest of the hearings today and, quite frankly, I'm very, very disturbed that the government is moving closure.

You might notice that our party did not speak in the last rotation. We let it go around this particular Legislature in order to allow all members for Ottawa-Carleton to have an opportunity to speak here.

We have such arrogance shown.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** You did so speak in the last rotation.

**Mr Sterling:** We did not speak in the last rotation. You missed your turn and we missed our turn in the last rotation, quite frankly, and the minister is wrong again.

The arrogance of this government in not even allowing the MPPs for the area of Ottawa-Carleton to express their concerns on second reading is without precedent. We also have noted in here that we're going to be allowed all of one hour on third reading after we have some committee hearings.

The committee hearings can only take place until April 25, which hardly allows the proper notice for hearings to take place in Ottawa-Carleton. This notice, of course, doesn't allow us the opportunity to go down to Ottawa-Carleton and hear the people on the fact of the major objection of the opposition on this bill, and that is the inclusion of mayors on regional council. That was not part of the Kirby report. That was not part of the Bartlett report. That was not part of any report with regard to this legislation and never has been debated by the public in Ottawa-Carleton.

I am astounded at the arrogance of this government. The opposition was going to allow proper debate of this particular bill, and we in fact have passed opportunities to stand in this Legislature and speak. I'm disgusted by this government.

**Mr White:** I'd like to comment upon the member for Nepean's speech and not some conjecture about some other issue that the member for Carleton brings up.

I would like to reflect upon the issues that the member for Nepean brought up. I think the member for Nepean represents his area very well. I think the issues that he brings up, the concern about police headquarters, the concern about his local board of trade, are legitimate concerns in his area.

I would, however, encourage him to take something of a broader view, because after all, with a regionally based police office or police services, we're going to have the same level of service available throughout the Ottawa-Carleton area. On the issue that the member brings up about the police headquarters, for example, it's going to be necessary to have police stations and we'll have police headquarters regardless of what the legislation says.

These are essentially important issues in his representation of his area, but I think if he took a larger perspective, a perspective that says Nepean is part of eastern

Ontario, part of Ontario, part of the Ottawa-Carleton area, and that as the Ottawa-Carleton area benefits, as that region benefits, so does his municipality and so do his constituents.

He has to look, I would suggest, at a broader issue. He suggests that some people should have a greater voice, greater representation than others. I would suggest that in the province of Ontario, we had the opportunity in the last federal election of electing 98 members of the Liberal Party to Ottawa, and despite that representation, with 10 million people in this province, they don't represent us.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired.  
1700

**Mr Grandmaitre:** Now we know where we stand. This government can't be trusted. They don't have an agenda. Right now, they feel the pressure. They want to put closure in so that the people in this House will not have their say. As pointed out by the member for Nepean, you can't trust this government for the simple reason that it doesn't know. They don't have an agenda and they want to do it their way. As I pointed out before, it's their way or the highway. I think it's irresponsible on the part of the government to act in the way it's doing today. We will continue the debate until 6 o'clock, but I think it's irresponsible on the part of the government.

Now they say that we're going to have two days of hearings and they will choose who will be heard and not heard. I'm sure of this. I find this kind of tactic unacceptable. But the people of Ottawa-Carleton will have their say very, very shortly. They will feel the pressure. Maybe the member for Ottawa Centre has no intention of running again, and maybe she should quit now. She will not be re-elected because of the tactics used in this House.

**The Acting Speaker:** We have time for one more question or comment.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** It is discouraging, having spent so little time debating this on second reading, to now have to sit here and receive a notice from this government that there will be a closure motion moved on this piece of legislation. I say that simply because there are not a number of members from the Ottawa area who would like to speak to this legislation. In fact, out of a number of 130 who sit in here, I think there are probably six or seven who would choose to enter into this debate.

**Mr White:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order—

**Mr Stockwell:** Madam Speaker, can you stop the clock while this guy wastes my time with a pointless point of order?

**Mr White:** The member did not address the issue of closure; his debate was on Bill 143. Certainly that's the issue that's under debate, not some other issue.

**The Acting Speaker:** I'm allowing the member to comment.

**Mr Stockwell:** May I put my time back on my clock? Thank you, Madam Speaker. They move closure and then dimwits like this get up and start moving points of order that don't exist. It is very frustrating, I might add.



*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** I will move on. It's frustrating when they move closure motions on bills as important as this when the speaking list consists of six or seven or eight MPPs from the affected regions who ask to speak on a piece of legislation that is so very important to their regions. Now we get a closure motion that doesn't even allow a minimum of that number of speakers to stand up in the Legislature and make their point.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** I've got to listen to heckling from the House leader for the government side. He moves closure on absolutely everything. On every issue we came to in the last session there was a closure motion. They were slapping them on twice a day in some instances in this Legislature, day after day after day. What it does say is that whenever the next election comes and whoever moves into power, this place is going to act in the same fashion, without proper debate and with silly motions of closure such as this which aren't going to allow the people to debate the issue.

I dare the minister to go to Ottawa-Carleton when these public hearings are held, because I'd like to see that minister stand before his critics and defend it by suggesting that closure motions are in order.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired. The member for Nepean has two minutes to respond.

**Mr Daigeler:** To the parliamentary assistant, because I must refute this, I'm getting very sick of Nepean people being accused of being parochial and being invited to take a broader perspective. I can tell all of you over there that we've had a broader perspective for a lot longer than the city of Ottawa. That's the point I've made. We have elected our regional councillors for 15 years. What we are afraid of is that we are going to be swallowed up by a municipality that has not shown the fiscal knowledge and management that the city of Nepean has shown.

Unfortunately, in the meantime we have received notice of this terrible intervention. I see the government House leader sitting here. It is just absolutely outrageous that one hour is going to be allotted for the third reading stage of this bill. If that's the type of democracy, if that's the type of consultation this government is having, I think it's absolutely unacceptable and I will have nothing to do with it.

However, I can certainly tell you that if this government doesn't hold hearings, as it should, in Ottawa-Carleton, my party certainly is going to hold hearings and is going to invite the public of Ottawa-Carleton to speak to this bill. We're going to be there and listen to the people, if this government doesn't listen to them, because we have made a commitment to represent the people of our area and we have the right and the responsibility to speak on behalf of our people and not be shut up by this government.

I think the NDP government should be ashamed of itself for putting forward things like this, and I guess the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not here right now because he's ashamed. He's hiding because he's already been accused by the Speaker of this House as having

come very close to contempt of the Legislature. That's the issue here and I think they will see in the next election what's going to happen to them. What we're seeing here are the death throes of a government.

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound):** I will take only a few minutes, because I'm not from this area. I'm really disappointed in this government. This is another typical ploy of this government to cut us off. This is the second time you've done it to me. I can tell you that I'm very upset that you would do something like that again. You talk about democracy. There's no democracy here. If you get in a corner, you cut people off.

I want to tell you that most of the municipalities in my area have written to me and asked me to oppose this bill. You're getting into areas where you don't belong and you're starting to tell the municipalities what to do.

I just want to point out one thing that the minister said, that this is a unique area. If this is true, then maybe we'd better start looking at the rest of the areas in the province and their unique ways, quit making laws down here that cover the whole province of Ontario and have a bit of flexibility, if that's what you think. One day you think one thing and the next day you think something else, and then when you get upset, you just say, "We're going to cut you off." You're using your power of the majority of votes to do this.

I want to make it quite clear that the people in my riding think this is an awful bill and do not support it. I'm not from their area, so what I'm going to do is give up my time so that members from that area have a chance to speak. I want to tell you that this is one of the worst things that this undemocratic government is doing to us.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Grey-Owen Sound for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr Daigeler:** As to what the member just said, I would hope that some of the members who are from other parts of the province would take part in the debate as well or would be given an opportunity to take part in the debate. I know the member for Welland-Thorold is here right now. I'm sure he has some comments to make. He's nodding and nodding and I certainly hope that he's going to be given an opportunity, not as extensive an opportunity as he had on the car insurance bill, but nevertheless a reasonable one. That's all we're asking for, a reasonable opportunity to speak to this, because the implications of this bill go far beyond the Ottawa-Carleton area.

That's what has to come across here. I'm saying to all the members who are on the government side, and certainly on this side of the House as well, that the implications of this bill are of great significance not just for Ottawa-Carleton but for all municipalities and for all politicians and for all people of this province.

If they are afraid of having Big Brother or Big Sister run their affairs through Toronto, then I think they should pay attention to this particular bill that's before us today. That's why there has to be more debate, and not just, I insist, by the members from Ottawa-Carleton, but by all

members from the province. That's why AMO, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, has taken a very strong stand in defence of the suburban municipalities of Ottawa-Carleton.

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** No, they have not.

**Mr Daigeler:** The Minister of Municipal Affairs is saying again, with his credibility totally in tatters, "They have not." Certainly they have. If you have not read your correspondence, which obviously you haven't, then I think you should take the time out and read your correspondence and what AMO has said about this particular bill.

As I said earlier, the credibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs is in tatters. That's why I do hope that members across the province are going to speak to this legislation.

1710

**Mr Sterling:** I'd just like to thank the member for Grey-Owen Sound for being so considerate in terms of allowing the other Ottawa members an opportunity to have a chance to speak on this bill. He really wanted to speak at greater length on this bill, because he is very, very much concerned with its overall effect on the restructuring of local government across Ontario.

Some of the other members in my party wanted to speak as well in that regard, and they're going to be denied that because this government is moving prematurely in terms of closing down debate on this bill because it's frightened of the overwhelming lack of support for this particular piece of legislation across this province by a huge number of municipalities that have written to municipalities in my area. They're against this bill and they're against this government for doing it.

**Mr White:** I want to congratulate the member for Grey-Owen Sound, not only on his presentation about this important issue and about the importance of parliamentary democracy, but also upon reminding us of the fact that today is Tartan Day and that on a day like today, we should honour and respect all those important parts of our community, friends like my friend Mr Buchanan, who is wearing his tartan, and myself. I am unfortunately not wearing mine, but I'm certainly glad to see my friend so well regaled in his own tartan and respecting his cultural traditions.

**Mr David Johnson:** I would like to thank the member for Grey-Owen Sound as well for his consideration for the other members in this House, the other members who will be speaking on this matter, and this is a—

*Laughter.*

**Mr David Johnson:** I know there are some members from the government who find this a funny issue and laugh, perhaps at the garb of the member who's bringing this to our attention or whatever, but you know, we're talking about the most important level of government in Ontario, the municipal government—in my view; I hope this is shared by many members in this House on both sides of this House—the government closest to the people, and we're talking about putting in place a structure, and the Minister of Housing says, you know, we're

afraid of change, that change is coming and we need to look at new ways of doing things.

I can tell you that the municipalities have been successful for decades. They've been successful in balancing their budget for decades. Has this provincial government been successful in achieving that? Absolutely not. But we, according to the Minister of Housing, are in a good position to implement change, to impose change and not listen to the people, not listen to the people in Ottawa. Has this particular bill been brought to Ottawa for discussion?

Yes, we've had the Kirby report. Yes, we've had the Bartlett report. Yes, we've had the Graham report. Not one of those reports has recommended leaving the mayors off the regional council, every one of those reports.

Municipalities across Ontario, not just in the Ottawa-Carleton region, are communicating with us, telling us they oppose the structure that's being put in place. But the ministers from this government know better. They listen to some of the press in Ottawa. The press tells them what the people think. Now, that's an interesting concept. If you listen to some members of the press and they say what you like to hear, then that's what the people think.

It's too bad we didn't have some more discussion on this, some more debate, and it's too bad we're not going to allow the committee to go to Ottawa to hear what the real people think about this.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Grey-Owen Sound has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Murdoch:** I'll be very brief so my friends from Ottawa will have a chance to debate this. It is unfortunate, Mr Minister, that you will not listen to the municipalities that surround Ottawa, the rest of the municipalities of Ontario that are telling you this is wrong, and AMO's telling you this is wrong. I cannot understand what's wrong with this minister, why he's not listening. They're great sometimes at consulting. Even in this case, they haven't consulted. So I do hope that this government will let some consultation in Ottawa be had, and I will give up my time now to the people from Ottawa so that they can speak on it.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate on this bill?

**Mr Bisson:** I'm only going to take a few short moments to comment on the bill. There are a number of aspects of the bill that are of interest to a number of people I've been dealing with through my tenure with l'Office des affaires francophones and I'd like to be able to touch on that.

The other thing I'd like to touch on very quickly is the debate that we're into now in regard to the whole question of closure—I'd like to talk about it a little bit later—and bringing some of that into the light and getting people to understand really what is happening here at the House at this time.

Bill 143, in short, does a couple of things. It deals with the question of regional government for the regional authority of Ottawa in regard to how you get representation at the regional level of government for the people of Ottawa-Carleton. The other thing that it does is that it



also deals with the question of school boards in respect to the French-language school boards within the area.

As a number of people might know, the region of Ottawa has a French public school board and it also has a French separate school board that is set up for the people of that area. One of the things that happened in setting up that board system is that we ended up actually with three levels of administration and three political levels of administration as well within that particular board system.

What this bill seeks to do is to be able to fix that to a certain extent by removing one of the levels of administration within the school boards as well as one of the political levels. Basically, to explain the way that it works right now is, as such, you have basically a board that is elected, which is the French-language school board, and presently, underneath that board administration and underneath that political structure, you have two panels, one being the French public and the other being French separate. What that has done is basically put people in a situation where you have really three different levels and three different systems of administration for the school boards in that area.

What the bill tends to do is to take away the board structure that we have now and recognize the panels themselves as being—

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Within the rules of this place, the standing orders, a government can move a closure motion on this piece of legislation and then be so crass as to take up all the time that's left speaking?

**The Speaker:** To the honourable member for Etobicoke West, there is no such motion on the floor of the House at this time.

**Mr Stockwell:** Mr Speaker, can I help you with something?

**The Speaker:** No. Would the member take his seat, please. The honourable member for Cochrane South.

**Mr Bisson:** As I was saying, there are a couple of issues that need to be dealt with because they're issues that were brought to me, as a matter of fact, back in 1990 when I first took office in this place in regard to the school boards, and I wanted to have an opportunity to be able to comment. No, I'm not a person from Ottawa, although I do love that particular area, but I also have a responsibility within the government in regard to dealing with issues that concern francophones across the province of Ontario and taxpayers in general and I do have the right to do so.

Basically, what the bill is going to do is deal with trying to simplify the administration of the school board system within the Ottawa area so that, first of all, the French public and the French Catholic panels will actually become school boards and recognized as such, and it will reduce the administration to a large extent for those particular boards as well as reduce one political level that you have within the board system itself.

There's going to be other work that's going to be done and we're going to comment on a little bit later in regard to how we deal with the question of getting boards to

work a little bit closer together, but that'll be for another debate.

I want to very quickly just say to the people watching, because we're into a bit of a political discussion right now in regard to this whole issue and I just want to put that in perspective before I give the floor to the member from Ottawa, that what's been happening is it's been a number of years that the people of Ottawa and provincial governments, not only ours but governments before, basically dealt with—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Bisson:** That was pretty good. Anyway, I was saying that there's been a move over a period of years by which to deal with this particular issue. So it's not as if all of a sudden government is making up its mind in the heat of the night or the dead of the night to move on something that all of a sudden came out of the blue. This is an issue that's been going on for a number of years. It started with the previous government, it carried on with this particular government, and we're moving forward in the legislative process to make it happen.

There are only two members from Ottawa who have not had the opportunity to speak and I'm going to leave the floor for one of those members to speak because I see he's in the chamber now, ready to take debate. There's no attempt on the part of the government not to give the other members, the members from Ottawa, the opportunity to speak. We will do so. If we hadn't got into this whole hassle that we got into about 20 minutes ago, both the members from Ottawa left to speak on this would have done so. I would leave the floor to the member from Ottawa.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Cochrane South for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments. Seeing none, is there further debate?

1720

**Mr Gilles E. Morin (Carleton East):** Before I start debating an issue which I have very close to my heart, I'd like to wish a happy anniversary to my colleague from Ottawa East: 25 years in politics. I must say, because I really enjoy his friendship, I won't wish him another 25 years in politics.

**Mr Grandmaître:** Thank God. Not with this government.

**Mr Morin:** I want him to live long.

I welcome this opportunity to debate Bill 143. It is long overdue. The restructuring of any political institution is never to be taken lightly, nor should it occur in a process of bartering, of exchanges that are not directly related to the public good. Unfortunately, since Bill 143 was introduced last July, the residents of Ottawa-Carleton have been subjected to partisan games, courtesy of this government, games that serve no purpose and that merely muddy the waters. This government has repeatedly accused the opposition parties of delaying debate on Bill 143.

Last November, the member for Ottawa Centre declared that her government was willing to let Bill 143, or Bill 77 as it was then known, die unless it was assured

easy passage in the Legislature. She even said that she would blame local members if the reforms did not go ahead. She then went on to state the importance of the reforms to the region. One can only conclude that reforms are obviously not as important to the member as petty politics.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs said: "Delay of this legislation is already creating some difficulties for the region's clerks in terms of deadlines. Candidates for regional positions have already been inconvenienced by the delays in registration." Well, I wonder why. Does the minister not have a clue? Perhaps if this government was less inclined to play games and more serious in going about the task of governing, there would be no uncertainty in Ottawa-Carleton. If this government was more upfront, the people of Ottawa-Carleton would know where they stand.

We don't need to hear phoney expressions of concern for the region's clerks and candidates from the minister when he is the person responsible for their predicament to begin with.

It is because of the upcoming civic elections that my colleagues and myself have been pressing the government to act, to do something. Our pleas, obviously, were not listened to. No one disputes that reform is necessary. The status quo is no longer acceptable. The residents of Ottawa-Carleton are looking for accountability and value for their money. For this reason, the reform process should be open and well explained so that there are no misunderstandings. In light of this, I believe that the decision to exclude local mayors from the regional council is an example of this government's lack of communication and vision.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs has written in a letter sent to the Liberal House leader that representation by population cannot be achieved if the mayors remain on regional council. This statement, coming from the minister, is totally unbelievable.

The election of councillors from the proposed new wards will meet the requirement for representation by population. But I would add that the inclusion of mayors will ensure the proper representation of each community's interest. Is it necessary to point out that the mayors are elected by all the citizens in their respective municipalities? This process, as we know, is as democratic as it can be. The fact is, mayors are representative and accountable to the electorate. They would remain accountable on regional council as well. Adding mayors to regional council does not detract from the principle of representation by population. On the contrary, it would enhance the overall representation of all parties and interests concerned.

Let it be clear that I support representation by population. This principle is one of the foundations of democratic society, but I wonder whether the citizens of Ottawa-Carleton would not also be well served on regional council by persons with a good grasp of local issues, by persons who are already making the necessary compromises on a daily basis, such as mayors. Mayors know their community so well—the people, the business, the arts community, the schools. Mayors have the pulse

of the people.

The closest link between government and people is at the municipal level. Only municipal government enjoys a close, familiar relationship with the members of its community. As cities change and grow, that link is threatened. It becomes more difficult to maintain, yet it remains essential if government is to remain a positive, humane and integrated part of our society. I do not wish to see the government become a distant entity, removed from its roots, because people are the root of government.

We have a duty to preserve this privileged relationship between government and population and, quite frankly, as members of society, we have a strong interest in doing so.

Living in today's society is difficult. You don't always know your neighbours. Everybody locks their doors at night in fear. We live in a society where more than ever before people feel alone, forgotten, useless. This does not mean that we don't cherish our privacy and anonymity, but we still feel a need to be a part of a group, a need to belong. The ties that bind us are familiar, but they are also local, community-oriented.

This, in my view, is where the municipal government comes in. The mayor and councillors are drawn from the community. They're well known by the locals. They can stop and talk to the people, get their input. This can be done in a manner that provincial and federal governments, try as hard as they might, cannot achieve. It is simply not the same. There is a distance between provincial and federal governments and the population that one does not find at the municipal level. It makes all the difference, and it must be preserved.

I don't understand why this government is working so hard to eliminate local governments, because that in essence is what Bill 143 leads to: the gradual disappearance of municipalities in favour of a regional government which may or may not be more efficient, which will inevitably be more removed from the immediate concerns of residents.

Bill 143 essentially sets up municipal governments as institutions secondary or inferior to regional government. The proposed separation of jurisdictions between regional and municipal governments reduces municipalities to playing a supporting role.

This possibility that local governments may disappear has raised the concerns of many individuals and organizations. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario believes that mayors have a major role to play. The city of Toronto asked the minister to withdraw Bill 143, or Bill 77 at the time, because it excludes the mayors from regional government. As this minister is aware, mayors in the greater Toronto area sit on regional council. I'm not saying that Ottawa-Carleton should imitate Toronto, but on the other hand, if Toronto and adjoining communities are benefiting from the presence of both elected representatives and mayors on council, why should this not be considered as a workable solution in Ottawa-Carleton?

1730

It is as though the minister had already decided, so he says, that this is good for the national capital area and



that's it—no discussion, no serious justification of his position and, heaven forbid, no additional public consultation, if only to ensure public approval of the proposed reforms.

Never mind the fact that the poll conducted by Coopers and Lybrand for the Kirby commission revealed that 76% of the people declared satisfaction with local municipalities or local government, while the rate of satisfaction with regional government was 57%. Is this not significant? Do people's views not count for this minister?

I am pleased to report that in the eyes of the regional chair of Ottawa-Carleton, Peter Clark, the public's views are relevant. Mr Clark proposed last November that a referendum be held during the 1997 municipal election to allow the public to decide whether the mayors should continue to sit on regional council.

I would like to bring forth the concerns expressed by Citizens for Good Government, which is a panel of representatives—

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Oh no, not again.

**Hon Mr Philip:** Who are they?

**Mr Morin:** They have their right, like anybody else, to voice their opinion, like your own committees and groups. It is a panel of representatives from various community organizations in the Ottawa-Carleton area. My colleagues and I met with them a few weeks ago. Some of its spokespeople have declared to us that they are terribly worried about the democratic process, accountability, the economic and financial implications and public security, all related to Bill 143.

Public satisfaction with local government being so high, these organizations question the need to restructure an institution which is clearly meeting its responsibilities well. They deplore the lack of public consultation. They and myself are appalled at the actions of a government that would, only months before an election, redraw the election boundaries and the legislation that governs individuals running for office. They are concerned about the cost that reform might incur in the form of higher taxes and other adjustments related to the integration of administration and services.

On this last point, I should add that the Gloucester Chamber of Commerce has expressed great concern with Bill 143. Minister, the chamber of commerce has over 700 members concerned with the increased cost that will be inevitable and with the reduction of the control and authority of the local government. Mr Jim Anderson, executive director of the Gloucester Chamber of Commerce, said, "The proposed NDP regional government restructuring is undemocratic, ill-timed and totally out of touch with the current climate of economic hardship and with the publicly stated views of our local and regional taxpaying businesses and communities."

What is so deeply regrettable about this whole debate is that it didn't have to be this way. There was definitely a consensus among residents of Ottawa-Carleton for change. As Mr Kirby notes in his report, however, that consensus did not imply that structural change was essential. He goes on to say, "Change can also be

achieved through improvements and in distribution of responsibilities between local and regional governments."

I very much support a sound economic development policy in Ottawa-Carleton. There is absolutely a need for a coherent, coordinated economic development strategy in this region. It is simply not evident that these reforms will achieve this goal. A hope that things will turn out well should not be the deciding factor in implementing reforms.

With Bill 143, the new regional council would be given a wider range of responsibilities than it currently holds. It would gain exclusive authority to acquire industrial, institutional and commercial land for economic development purposes. Area municipalities could continue to deal with the industrial properties they currently own, but they could not acquire any new industrial lands.

It's important to note, as did my colleague the member for Ottawa East, that the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton approved a recommendation that the minister amend Bill 143 to permit both the regional government and the area municipalities to assemble to develop lands for industrial, commercial and institutional purposes. The Ottawa-Carleton Economic Development Corp did the very same thing.

What does this tell the minister? Is he listening? There are many persons in the Ottawa-Carleton region who do not agree with some of the reforms contained in Bill 143. I haven't cited them all. These persons raise important concerns which don't appear to be taken seriously, not at all seriously, by the minister.

If the regional council's new responsibilities are to be exercised with the proper regard due to municipal concerns and interests, then mayors must be included on regional council. I have spoken at length about the need to include mayors on regional council because I believe that municipal government is the one closest to the people and that it must be preserved.

I want to mention that I do support elements of Bill 143; for example, the focus on region-wide interests. The point is that Ottawa-Carleton does represent an integrated economy and infrastructure. There has to be some degree of cohesion where policymaking is concerned. I mentioned earlier the need for a coherent and coordinated economic development strategy. This is crucial to the future economic and social wellbeing of the region. On the whole, however, it is simply not evident that many of the reforms will lead to greater efficiency and improved services. The real costs of Bill 143 have yet to be calculated.

I would like to say a few words about the amendments to the Ottawa-Carleton French-Language School Board Act, amendments which were just recently added to Bill 143. Municipal politics and education are two distinct matters which should not be treated within the same bill. This practice of so-called omnibus bills, where different subject matters are dealt with in the same body of legislation, is not acceptable and detracts from the real, proper merits of each issue. French-language education for the French minorities in Ontario is a serious matter. It is a source of many concerns to all francophones in the region, indeed in the province. The amendment to Bill

143 does not even begin to address these concerns. French-language education does not lie within the minister's mandate and should not be tacked on to another already debatable piece of legislation.

I'd like to read a letter that I received from the employees' association of the Ottawa-Carleton board, just to indicate to you how people are confused. People are simply asking for direction, and this is what we're trying to do here in this House.

"I write to you as president of the Employees' Association of Ottawa-Carleton which represents, amongst others, employees of the full board of the Ottawa-Carleton French-Language School Board.

"We were astounded to learn by a newspaper article that a bill to abolish the full board of the Ottawa-Carleton French-Language School Board was currently before the Legislature. We had been told by a legal representative of the Ministry of Education that the bill was not to be introduced before the end of April. Moreover, the employer had been provided with a copy of the bill on March 22, 1994, whereas it took numerous calls from myself to Toronto to be finally provided with a copy only at 16:47 on March 25, 1994. We are informed that the government intended to put the bill to third reading as of this past Monday, March 28, 1994. The bill, should it become law, will apparently abolish the full board and puts into serious doubt the future of our members.

1740

"We find it inconceivable that those most directly affected by the closure of the full board would not have been consulted to any meaningful extent prior to the introduction of the bill. This action by government is made still more outrageous as I was personally promised by the Minister of Education and Training on February 15, 1994, that we would be consulted at each step of the process.

"We demand that this bill not be put to third reading before the people most affected by it are consulted and that we be consulted on all future steps involving the bill or its regulations.

"Yours very truly,

"Ottawa-Carleton Employees' Association

"Gerard Poirier."

It is unfortunate indeed that we bring two bills together. It's sort of a decoy, in my sense, because the bill dealing with the French-language issue is a bill that I would have voted on, but it is included in a bill over which I have objections. You bring it in: "We know that they're in favour. The school board will sway them in." Minister, it doesn't work that way.

I thought that you, with your experience, with the numbers of years that you have in this House, would have a greater respect for the process, for the implementation of legislation. Frankly, I am disappointed. I am really disappointed, Minister, and this is the reason I'm so pleased to be able to debate this bill today. I want to appeal to your common sense when it comes time to debate it in the House, to debate it in front of the committee, that you take the time to listen to the amendments that will be brought forward and that you will agree and

that you will be flexible enough to amend the legislation so that it benefits everyone.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Carleton East for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments.

**Mr Chiarelli:** I'm pleased to comment on the speech of my colleague from Carleton East. He can always be counted on to elevate the quality of debate in the Legislature. He has a reputation for that and he has done so again.

He indicated in his speech that the debate didn't have to be this way. The lines did not have to be drawn as harshly and as callously as they have on this issue, indeed splitting the urban community and the suburban community.

We now have on record that the government intends to move closure of Bill 143, the Ottawa-Carleton government legislation. I would hope that the government, in the remaining process that we have, will take a cue from the member for Carleton East and have an open mind, elevate the debate and hopefully try to be peacemaker in Ottawa-Carleton between the urban and suburban communities.

I think there are some areas of accommodation that can be made. I think that if we all approach the debate along the tenor of the member for Carleton East, to look at it rationally without getting involved in personalities, perhaps in the very short time that is going to be permitted to us, some accommodation, compromise and agreement can be made.

**Hon Mr Philip:** I want to start off by complimenting the member for what I thought was a reasonable speech, one that was not full of rhetoric and bombast, and indeed made some arguments that I think were worth listening to.

I would like to deal, however, with one of the arguments that he makes which I think is really fallacious, and that is comparing Ottawa-Carleton to Metropolitan Toronto. In Metropolitan Toronto the mayors have six out of 34 seats, and in Ottawa-Carleton, by putting the mayors on, we would have had 11 out of 30 seats.

In other words, Ottawa-Carleton, compared to Metro, has almost twice the number of lower-tier municipalities. The range in the size of the area municipalities is much greater in Ottawa-Carleton than it is in Metro. In Ottawa-Carleton the smallest unit has less than 1% of the population of the largest unit, whereas in Metro the smallest unit comprises 16% of the largest unit.

There are many other municipalities with a smaller portion of the region's population in Ottawa-Carleton than in Metro. In Ottawa-Carleton more than half the units each have a population less than 18,000, and this is less than 6% of the largest unit's population in the city of Ottawa. In Metro, only two of the six are significantly smaller than the largest unit, but in no case are these units less than 16% of the largest unit.

I just say to the honourable member that the comparison between having the mayors on regional council in Ottawa-Carleton and the fact that the mayors are on in Metropolitan Toronto just doesn't work. It is not the same comparison. All the differences I outlined show that



it is not a reasonable comparison and I just ask the honourable member, knowing that he is a reasonable person, to take a look at those arguments.

**M. Jean Poirier (Prescott et Russell) :** Moi, je ne comprends vraiment pas certaines choses, dans le sens que lorsque je vois un ministre combiner ensemble deux sujets, comme mon collègue de Carleton-Est l'a mentionné, ça ne peut que confondre les gens.

Vous savez bien que nous, à titre de députés, devons interpréter pour la population ce que veut faire un gouvernement, et on essaie de le faire régulièrement. Mais à la dernière minute, quand il y a des changements apportés comme ça, et de mettre dans le même projet de loi deux sujets aussi différents, aussi —

**L'hon M<sup>me</sup> Gigantes:** Bizarres.

**M. Poirier :** — bizarres, que ce soit mis ensemble dans le même projet de loi comme ça, c'est très difficile, surtout à la dernière minute, la façon de laquelle c'est fait, de rapprocher ça dans un même projet de loi pour que les gens puissent essayer de comprendre quelles sont les intentions réelles du gouvernement et du ministre pour fonctionner de cette façon-là.

Il reste quelques semaines, justement, jusqu'à la fin du mois de juin, pour finir la troisième session du 35<sup>e</sup> Parlement. Je m'imagine combien de fois le ministre va vouloir apporter ces changements-là. On est passé de 77 à 143. Mon cher collègue de Carleton-Est va peut-être m'aider à deviner. Ça va peut-être être 212, 303, qui sait ?

Mais en tout cas, ça complique la situation et, comme mon collègue le sait très bien, nous, les députés franco-ontariens, sommes surtout très intéressés au dossier du Conseil scolaire de langue française d'Ottawa-Carleton. Il y a des changements à apporter. Nous sommes au courant. Nous voulons appuyer ce principe-là, mais mettre les deux ensemble dans un même projet de loi, ça complique d'une façon tout à fait bizarre.

À ce jour, je ne comprends pas pourquoi le ministre insiste à le faire de cette façon-là. Il a sûrement son agenda caché derrière tout ça, mais nous, on va vraiment s'opposer à ce genre de stratégie-là qui n'a aucun bon sens, aucune logique, aucune suite dans les idées pour régler les deux problèmes bien distincts.

**The Speaker:** Further questions and/or comments? If not, the honourable member for Carleton East has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Morin:** I just want to tell you, Minister, that perhaps I did not communicate clearly enough. Sure, you come out with figures about Toronto, making a comparison with Ottawa-Carleton; that's fine, but your colleague to your right the member for Ottawa East knows Carleton East well. She was a member there for two terms—

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** Ottawa Centre.

**Mr Morin:** Ottawa Centre, I'm sorry. She knows Carleton East extremely well. She knows how this community was developed. She knows the feelings of sentiment that exist within that community.

Sometimes we have to go over politics and numbers to understand what the people really feel, and this is why a

hearing, well conducted, would be extremely important. Give a chance to people to voice their opinions. Reports are fine, but a lot of people are worried about what will happen to the community that they built. They pay taxes and they don't want to be involved with the responsibilities thrown by others on them.

This is the main issue. This is why, Minister, I appeal to you. Make sure that you listen properly to the people. Don't be doctrinaire and establish, as a fait accompli, that a law should be implemented. You don't work that way. Let me assure you that if you operate that way, you won't see the end of it.

1750

What I find so disturbing, ce qui me renverse, c'est de voir le fait que vous avez mis ensemble deux lois complètement opposées : une loi qui traite avec un sujet excessivement important aux francophones de l'Ontario. Vous les mettez ensemble. C'est un bill omnibus, et on oublie tout.

Je vous assure, Monsieur le Ministre, que les Franco-Ontariens comprennent très bien le système. Si c'est la façon dont vous voulez opérer, si vous voulez faire des amis, je vous assure que ce n'est pas la bonne façon.

I want to end my debate. Minister, again I appeal to your common sense, just straight common sense. You know Ottawa. You were educated there. Make sure that you take the time and listen to what people have to say.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate?

**Mr McGuinty:** In the few minutes remaining, I'll try to get some comments that I feel are relevant and important on the record.

First of all, I should indicate that it is my intention to support this bill. I have some reservations, but I should indicate that my mayor supports this bill, my city council supports this bill, my councillors who find their wards within my riding support this bill—four out of five, in any event, do—my community associations support this bill, my police chief supports this bill, and my board of trade supports this bill.

Some people may derive some particular partisan pleasure in noting that we have division within the ranks of the Liberals here, that we have division among the members of a particular party and, as such, this has been traditionally seen as a sign of weakness. I would submit that that is old-style politics, and I'll just take the opportunity right now to remind people who have not had an opportunity to read my leader's recent position paper called the Lyn McLeod Commitment to Changing Politics, we now have a new system for whipping our votes, and I think it's somewhat revolutionary. I'm very proud of it, and we intend to take every advantage of it with respect to this particular bill.

We now have three types of votes we categorize according to the need for consensus or party discipline on a particular issue. The first type of vote is a completely free vote, the second type of vote is one which allows for some dissension and the third type of vote would be one that I would assume we would bring to bear with respect to a throne speech or a budget where we would require that all members vote in favour.

In any event, with respect to this bill, we're going to see some of our members voting for it and some voting against it. I see that as a sign of strength, as a sign of openness, as a sign that our party gives its members the necessary leeway to properly represent their own particular constituencies and their own particular needs and concerns.

One of the concerns I have is that the process that has culminated in this bill being before this House today was one which was fraught with difficulties and, I would submit, needlessly so. There is a severe casualty in all of this and that is the relations between the city of Ottawa, frankly put, and the surrounding municipalities.

I'm not particularly concerned with AMO at this stage. I just want to speak as somebody who lives in Ottawa-Carleton. That is unfortunate because we have to work together. We have in the past, we are at present, and we will of course have to do so on a continuing basis in the future.

As I say, that casualty is a severe casualty, relations between the city of Ottawa and the surrounding municipalities, and it's going to take us some time to recover from some of the division, some of the discord that has been sown as a result of this bill and the process that has culminated in it being before this House today.

On that note, the mayors had in fact submitted alternative proposals with respect to their being allowed to sit on regional council. Peter Clark, the head of our regional council, the chairman, had also put forward a proposal. Those proposals were, I would submit, given very short shrift by the government. I think that's unfortunate.

I have a very real concern about mayors bringing a parochial interest to regional council. I think to ignore that potential would be to be wilfully blind. However, we have to work with these people, and at the end of the day, if that relationship is soured irreparably, then we will have done a great deal of damage.

With respect to the school board component of the bill, I support that as well. I have had the opportunity to speak with directors or deputy directors for the Ottawa Board of Education, the Ottawa Roman Catholic Separate School Board and both sectors of the French-language school board. I have reviewed with them the essentials of the bill and sought their opinion, and they are by and large, with some concerns, very much supportive.

My colleague the previous speaker has raised an issue which I hope the minister will be addressing; that is, the issue raised by employees of the Ottawa-Carleton employees' association, employees who work for the French-language school board.

I think it's important as well to recognize that the French-language school board really consists of three decision-making bodies. There's the conseil plénier or the full board and then the two sectors. So in a very real sense we're not going from one board to two; we're going from three decision-making bodies to two. That's pursuant to the recommendation of Brian Bourns in the Bourns report. I thought he made a great deal of sense in making that recommendation.

It would be nice to think that the boards would be able to have cooperated more with respect to their common interests, but the fact of the matter is, things weren't working, and it's my submission that the students and the ratepayers were suffering as a result. In any event, I hope this will put the two independent boards on a sound footing, that they'll be able to move towards some fiscal soundness and deliver a quality education in keeping with their very real potential.

The other thing I should indicate is that I've had an opportunity to discuss this matter with one councillor whose ward is located within my riding who expressed some very real concerns about some of the costs associated with this bill and in particular what we're going to be paying our regional councillors, our municipal councillors and some of the costs associated with setting up a new infrastructure at the regional headquarters. As I understand it, they've set over \$2 million for a capital budget. But those are matters that are properly within the control of Ottawa-Carleton representatives. I am not prepared to lose faith in their ability to address these issues and to ensure that costs are kept in control.

I think the most important aspect of this bill is that it provides for proper accountability. It allows my constituents to vote for their regional councillor in the upcoming municipal elections. I think it's simply unacceptable at the present that our decision-making people at regional council today, dealing with a budget in excess of \$1 billion, have not been voted into those offices. For that reason, I think the bill is important.

Of course we absolutely have to have committee hearings. It's important for the people of Ottawa-Carleton, all sectors, all communities, all municipalities, to have an opportunity to properly air their concerns, and I will certainly be pushing for that.

Mr Speaker, it being 6 of the clock, I'll move adjournment of the debate.

**The Speaker:** It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 10 of the clock tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 1800.



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO  
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

**Lieutenant Governor/Lieutenant-gouverneur: Lt Col The Hon/L'hon Henry N.R. Jackman CM, KStJ, BA, LLB, LLD**

**Speaker/Président: Hon/L'hon David Warner**

**Clerk/Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers**

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals/Greffier adjoint principal et Greffier des journaux: Alex D. McFedries**

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees/Greffière adjointe et Greffière des comités: Deborah Deller**

**Sergeant at Arms/Sergent d'armes: Thomas Stelling**

| Member/Député(e)                           | Constituency/Circonscription | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités  |
|--|------------------------------|-------------|--|
| Abel, Donald                               | Wentworth North/-Nord        | ND          | deputy government whip / whip adjoint du gouvernement  |
| Akande, Zanana L.                          | St Andrew-St Patrick         | ND          | parliamentary assistant to the Premier /<br>adjointe parlementaire du premier ministre   |
| <b>Allen, Hon/L'hon<br/>Richard</b>        | Hamilton West/-Ouest         | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Economic Development<br>and Trade / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère<br>du Développement économique et du Commerce  |
| Arnott, Ted                                | Wellington                   | PC          | Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates /<br>Vice-Président du Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses   |
| Beer, Charles                              | York-Mackenzie               | L           | Chair, standing committee on social development /<br>Président du Comité permanent des affaires sociales   |
| Bisson, Gilles                             | Cochrane South/-Sud          | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Northern Development and<br>Mines, parliamentary assistant to minister responsible for<br>francophone affairs / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre<br>du Développement du Nord et des Mines, adjoint parlementaire<br>du ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones |
| <b>Boyd, Hon/L'hon<br/>Marion</b>          | London Centre/-Centre        | ND          | Attorney General, minister responsible for women's issues /<br>procureure générale, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine  |
| Bradley, James J.                          | St Catharines                | L           | opposition deputy House leader /<br>chef parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition   |
| Brown, Michael A.                          | Algoma-Manitoulin            | L           | Chair, standing committee on general government /<br>Président du Comité permanent des affaires gouvernementales   |
| <b>Buchanan, Hon/L'hon<br/>Elmer</b>       | Hastings-Peterborough        | ND          | Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre<br>de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales  |
| Callahan, Robert V.                        | Brampton South/-Sud          | L           |  |
| Caplan, Elinor                             | Oriole                       | L           |  |
| Carr, Gary                                 | Oakville South/-Sud          | PC          | Progressive Conservative deputy House leader /<br>chef parlementaire adjoint du Parti progressiste-conservateur  |
| Carter, Jenny                              | Peterborough                 | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Citizenship /<br>adjointe parlementaire de la ministre des Affaires civiques  |
| <b>Charlton, Hon/L'hon<br/>Brian A.</b>    | Hamilton Mountain            | ND          | Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House<br>leader and minister responsible for the automobile insurance<br>review / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire<br>du gouvernement et délégué à l'Assurance-automobile  |
| Chiarelli, Robert                          | Ottawa West/-Ouest           | L           |  |
| <b>Christopherson,<br/>Hon/L'hon David</b> | Hamilton Centre/-Centre      | ND          | Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services /<br>solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels   |
| <b>Churley, Hon/L'hon<br/>Marilyn</b>      | Riverdale                    | ND          | Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations /<br>ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce  |
| Cleary, John C.                            | Cornwall                     | L           |  |
| Conway, Sean G.                            | Renfrew North/-Nord          | L           | Deputy Leader of the Opposition /<br>chef adjoint de l'opposition  |
| <b>Cooke, Hon/L'hon<br/>David S.</b>       | Windsor-Riverside            | ND          | Minister of Education and Training, minister responsible for the<br>Ontario Training and Adjustment Board / ministre de l'Éducation<br>et de la Formation, ministre responsable du Conseil ontarien<br>de formation et d'adaptation de la main-d'oeuvre  |

| Member/Député(e)                  | Constituency/Circonscription | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités   |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Cooper, Mike                      | Kitchener-Wilmot             | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Labour; Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development / adjoint parlementaire du ministre du Travail, Vice-Président du Comité permanent du développement des ressources   |
| <b>Coppen, Hon/L'hon Shirley</b>  | Niagara South/-Sud           | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs   |
| Cordiano, Joseph                  | Lawrence                     | L           | Chair, standing committee on public accounts / Président du Comité permanent des comptes publics  |
| Cousens, W. Donald                | Markham                      | PC          |   |
| Crozier, Bruce                    | Essex South/-Sud             | L           |   |
| Cunningham, Dianne                | London North/-Nord           | PC          |   |
| Curling, Alvin                    | Scarborough North/-Nord      | L           | opposition deputy whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition   |
| Dadamo, George                    | Windsor-Sandwich             | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Transportation / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Transports  |
| Daigeler, Hans                    | Nepean                       | L           | Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government / Vice-Président du Comité permanent des affaires gouvernementales   |
| Duignan, Noel                     | Halton North/-Nord           | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce   |
| Eddy, Ron                         | Brant-Haldimand              | L           | Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development / Vice-Président du Comité permanent des affaires sociales   |
| Elston, Murray J.                 | Bruce                        | L           | opposition House leader / chef parlementaire de l'opposition  |
| Eves, Ernie L.                    | Parry Sound                  | PC          | Progressive Conservative House leader / chef parlementaire du Parti progressiste-conservateur   |
| <b>Farnan, Hon/L'hon Mike</b>     | Cambridge                    | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Education and Training / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de l'Éducation et de la Formation  |
| Fawcett, Joan M.                  | Northumberland               | L           |   |
| Ferguson, Will                    | Kitchener                    | Ind         |   |
| Fletcher, Derek                   | Guelph                       | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Citizenship / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre des Affaires civiques   |
| Frankford, Robert                 | Scarborough East/-Est        | ND          |   |
| <b>Gigantes, Hon/L'hon Evelyn</b> | Ottawa Centre/-Centre        | ND          | Minister of Housing / ministre du Logement  |
| Grandmaître, Bernard              | Ottawa East/-Est             | L           |   |
| <b>Grier, Hon/L'hon Ruth</b>      | Etobicoke-Lakeshore          | ND          | Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé   |
| Haeck, Christel                   | St Catharines-Brock          | ND          | government whip; Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills / whip du gouvernement, Présidente du Comité permanent des règlements et des projets de loi privés  |
| <b>Hampton, Hon/L'hon Howard</b>  | Rainy River                  | ND          | Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles   |
| Hansen, Ron                       | Lincoln                      | ND          | Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly / Président du Comité permanent de l'Assemblée législative  |
| Harnick, Charles                  | Willowdale                   | PC          |   |
| Harrington, Margaret H.           | Niagara Falls                | ND          | First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House; Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice / Premier Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative, Vice-Présidente du Comité permanent de l'administration de la justice |
| Harris, Michael D.                | Nipissing                    | PC          | leader of the Progressive Conservative Party / chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur  |
| Haslam, Karen                     | Perth                        | ND          |   |



| Member/Député(e)                     | Constituency/Circonscription   | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités  |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| Hayes, Pat                           | Essex-Kent   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Municipal Affairs /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Affaires municipales   |
| Henderson, D. James                  | Etobicoke-Humber   | L           |  |
| Hodgson, Chris                       | Victoria-Haliburton  | PC          |  |
| Hope, Randy R.                       | Chatham-Kent   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Community and Social<br>Services / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Services sociaux<br>et communautaires  |
| Huget, Bob                           | Sarnia   | ND          | government whip; parliamentary assistant to Minister of<br>Environment and Energy; Chair, standing committee on<br>resources development / whip du gouvernement; adjoint<br>parlementaire du ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie,<br>Président du Comité permanent du développement des ressources   |
| Jackson, Cameron                     | Burlington South/-Sud  | PC          | Chair, standing committee on estimates /<br>Président du Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses   |
| Jamison, Norm                        | Norfolk  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Economic Development<br>and Trade / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre du<br>Développement économique et du Commerce  |
| Johnson, David                       | Don Mills  | PC          |  |
| Johnson, Paul R.                     | Prince Edward-<br>Lennox-South Hastings /<br>Prince Edward-Lennox-<br>Hastings-Sud | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Economic Development<br>and Trade; Chair, standing committee on finance and economic<br>affairs / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre du Développement<br>économique et du Commerce, Président du Comité permanent<br>des finances et des affaires économiques   |
| Jordan, Leo                          | Lanark-Renfrew   | PC          |  |
| Klopp, Paul                          | Huron  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Agriculture, Food and<br>Rural Affairs / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Agriculture,<br>de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales   |
| Kormos, Peter                        | Welland-Thorold  | ND          |  |
| Kwinter, Monte                       | Wilson Heights   | L           |  |
| <b>Lankin, Hon/L'hon<br/>Frances</b> | Beaches-Woodbine   | ND          | Minister of Economic Development and Trade /<br>ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce  |
| <b>Laughren, Hon/L'hon<br/>Floyd</b> | Nickel Belt  | ND          | Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance /<br>vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances  |
| Lessard, Wayne                       | Windsor-Walkerville  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Environment and Energy /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Environnement et<br>de l'Énergie   |
| <b>Mackenzie, Hon/L'hon<br/>Bob</b>  | Hamilton East/-Est   | ND          | Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail   |
| MacKinnon, Ellen                     | Lambton  | ND          | Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills /<br>Vice-Présidente du Comité permanent des règlements et<br>des projets de loi privés  |
| Mahoney, Steven W.                   | Mississauga West/-Ouest  | L           | opposition chief whip / whip en chef de l'opposition   |
| Malkowski, Gary                      | York East/-Est   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education and Training /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Éducation et<br>de la Formation  |
| Mammoliti, George                    | Yorkview   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Solicitor General and Minister of<br>Correctional Services / adjoint parlementaire du solliciteur<br>général et ministre des Services correctionnels  |
| Marchese, Rosario                    | Fort York  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to the Premier; parliamentary assistant to<br>Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs; Chair, standing committee<br>on administration of justice / adjoint parlementaire du premier<br>ministre, adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Affaires<br>intergouvernementales, Président du Comité permanent<br>de l'administration de la justice |
| Marland, Margaret                    | Mississauga South/-Sud   | PC          | Chair, standing committee on government agencies /<br>Présidente du Comité permanent des organismes<br>gouvernementaux   |
| <b>Martel, Hon/L'hon<br/>Shelley</b> | Sudbury East/-Est  | ND          | Minister of Northern Development and Mines /<br>ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines   |

| Member/Député(e)                 | Constituency/Circonscription               | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités   |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------|---|
| Martin, Tony                     | Sault Ste Marie / Sault-Sainte-Marie       | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Education and Training / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation   |
| Mathysen, Irene                  | Middlesex                                  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Environment and Energy / adjointe parlementaire du ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie   |
| McClelland, Carman               | Brampton North/-Nord                       | L           |   |
| McGuinty, Dalton                 | Ottawa South/-Sud                          | L           |   |
| McLean, Allan K.                 | Simcoe East/-Est                           | PC          | Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies / Vice-Président du Comité permanent des organismes gouvernementaux   |
| McLeod, Lyn                      | Fort William                               | L           | Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition   |
| Miclash, Frank                   | Kenora                                     | L           | opposition deputy whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition   |
| Mills, Gordon                    | Durham East/-Est                           | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / adjoint parlementaire du solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels                         |
| Morin, Gilles E.                 | Carleton East/-Est                         | L           | Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président de la Chambre et Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative   |
| Morrow, Mark                     | Wentworth East/-Est                        | ND          |   |
| Murdoch, Bill                    | Grey-Owen Sound                            | PC          |   |
| Murdock, Sharon                  | Sudbury                                    | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Labour / adjointe parlementaire du ministre du Travail   |
| Murphy, Tim                      | St George-St David                         | L           |   |
| North, Peter                     | Elgin                                      | Ind         |   |
| O'Connor, Larry                  | Durham-York                                | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Health / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Santé  |
| O'Neil, Hugh                     | Quinte                                     | L           |   |
| O'Neill, Yvonne                  | Ottawa-Rideau                              | L           |   |
| Offer, Steven                    | Mississauga North/-Nord                    | L           |   |
| Owens, Stephen                   | Scarborough Centre/-Centre                 | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Finance / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Finances   |
| Perruzza, Anthony                | Downsview                                  | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / adjoint parlementaire du président du Conseil de gestion  |
| <b>Philip, Hon/L'hon Ed</b>      | Etobicoke-Rexdale                          | ND          | Minister of Municipal Affairs, minister responsible for the office for the greater Toronto area / ministre des Affaires municipales, ministre responsable du Bureau de la région du grand Toronto |
| Phillips, Gerry                  | Scarborough-Agincourt                      | L           |   |
| <b>Pilkey, Hon/L'hon Allan</b>   | Oshawa                                     | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Municipal Affairs / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Affaires municipales  |
| Poirier, Jean                    | Prescott and Russell / Prescott et Russell | L           |   |
| Poole, Dianne                    | Eglinton                                   | L           | Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts / Vice-Présidente du Comité permanent des comptes publics   |
| <b>Pouliot, Hon/L'hon Gilles</b> | Lake Nipigon / Lac-Nipigon                 | ND          | Minister of Transportation, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Transports, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones  |
| <b>Rae, Hon/L'hon Bob</b>        | York South/-Sud                            | ND          | Premier, President of the Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre, président du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires gouvernementales                      |
| Ramsay, David                    | Timiskaming                                | L           |   |
| Rizzo, Tony                      | Oakwood                                    | ND          | government whip; Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman / whip du gouvernement, Président du Comité permanent de l'ombudsman  |
| Runciman, Robert W.              | Leeds-Grenville                            | PC          | Progressive Conservative chief whip / whip en chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur   |
| Ruprecht, Tony                   | Parkdale                                   | L           |   |



| Member/Député(e)                      | Constituency/Circonscription                       | Party/Parti | Other responsibilities/Autres responsabilités  |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| <b>Silipo, Hon/L'hon Tony</b>         | Dovercourt   | ND          | Minister of Community and Social Services /<br>ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires   |
| Sola, John                            | Mississauga East/-Est                              | Ind         |  |
| Sorbara, Gregory S.                   | York Centre/-Centre                                | L           |  |
| Sterling, Norman W.                   | Carleton   | PC          |  |
| Stockwell, Chris                      | Etobicoke West/-Ouest                              | PC          |  |
| Sullivan, Barbara                     | Halton Centre/-Centre                              | L           |  |
| Sutherland, Kimble                    | Oxford   | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Finance /<br>adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Finances   |
| <b>Swarbrick, Hon/L'hon Anne</b>      | Scarborough West/-Ouest                            | ND          | Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation /<br>ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs  |
| Tilson, David                         | Dufferin-Peel                                      | PC          |  |
| Turnbull, David                       | York Mills   | PC          | Progressive Conservative deputy whip /<br>whip adjoint du Parti progressiste-conservateur  |
| Villeneuve, Noble                     | S-D-G & East Grenville<br>S-D-G & Grenville-Est    | PC          | Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House /<br>Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative  |
| <b>Ward, Hon/L'hon Brad</b>           | Brantford  | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Finance /<br>ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Finances  |
| <b>Wark-Martyn, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b> | Port Arthur  | ND          | Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Health /<br>ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Santé  |
| <b>Warner, Hon/L'hon David</b>        | Scarborough-Ellesmere                              | ND          | Speaker / Président  |
| Waters, Daniel                        | Muskoka-Georgian Bay                               | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs  |
| Wessenger, Paul                       | Simcoe Centre/-Centre                              | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Health; Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de la Santé, Vice-Président du Comité permanent de l'Assemblée législative  |
| White, Drummond                       | Durham Centre/-Centre                              | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Municipal Affairs / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Affaires municipales  |
| <b>Wildman, Hon/L'hon Bud</b>         | Algoma   | ND          | Minister of Environment and Energy, minister responsible for native affairs / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones   |
| <b>Wilson, Hon/L'hon Fred</b>         | Frontenac-Addington                                | ND          | Minister without Portfolio and chief government whip / ministre sans portefeuille et whip en chef du gouvernement  |
| Wilson, Gary                          | Kingston and The Islands /<br>Kingston et Les Îles | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Housing; Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre de Logement, Vice-Président du Comité permanent de l'ombudsman  |
| Wilson, Jim                           | Simcoe West/-Ouest                                 | PC          |  |
| Wininger, David                       | London South/-Sud                                  | ND          |  |
| Wiseman, Jim                          | Durham West/-Ouest                                 | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet; Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs / adjoint parlementaire du président du Conseil de gestion, Vice-Président du Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques                                  |
| Witmer, Elizabeth                     | Waterloo North/-Nord                               | PC          |  |
| Wood, Len                             | Cochrane North/-Nord                               | ND          | parliamentary assistant to Minister of Natural Resources / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Richesses naturelles  |
| <b>Ziemba, Hon/L'hon Elaine</b>       | High Park-Swansea                                  | ND          | Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for human rights, disability issues, seniors' issues and race relations / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre déléguée aux Droits de la personne, aux Affaires des personnes handicapées, aux Affaires des personnes âgées et aux Relations interraciales |

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Administration of justice/Administration de la justice**

Chair/Président: Rosario Marchese  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Margaret H. Harrington  
Zanana L. Akande, Gilles Bisson, Robert Chiarelli,  
Alvin Curling, Christel Haeck, Charles Harnick,  
Gary Malkowski, Tim Murphy, David Tilson,  
David Winninger  
Clerk/Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Estimates/Budgets des dépenses**

Chair/Président: Cameron Jackson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ted Arnott  
Donald Abel, Gary Carr, Noel Duignan, Murray J. Elston,  
Derek Fletcher, Pat Hayes, Wayne Lessard,  
Steven W. Mahoney, David Ramsay, Jim Wiseman  
Clerk/Greffier: Tonia Grannum

**Finance and economic affairs/**

**Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair/Président: Paul R. Johnson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Jim Wiseman  
Elinor Caplan, Gary Carr, W. Donald Cousens,  
Karen Haslam, Norm Jamison, Monte Kwinter,  
Wayne Lessard, Irene Mathysen, Gerry Phillips,  
Kimble Sutherland  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**General government/Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair/Président: Michael A. Brown  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Hans Daigeler  
Ted Arnott, George Dadamo, Bernard Grandmaître,  
David Johnson, George Mammoliti, Gordon Mills,  
Mark Morrow, Gregory S. Sorbara, Paul Wessenger,  
Drummond White  
Clerk/Greffier: Franco Carrozza

**Government agencies/Organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair/Présidente: Margaret Marland  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Allan K. McLean  
James J. Bradley, Jenny Carter, John C. Cleary,  
Alvin Curling, Robert Frankford, Margaret H. Harrington,  
Gary Malkowski, George Mammoliti, Daniel Waters,  
Elizabeth Witmer  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**Legislative Assembly/Assemblée législative**

Chair/Président: Ron Hansen  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Paul Wessenger  
George Dadamo, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon,  
Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin,  
Norman W. Sterling, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland,  
Noble Villeneuve  
Clerk/Greffière: Lisa Freedman

**Ombudsman**

Chair/Président: Tony Rizzo  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Gary Wilson  
Donald Abel, Zanana L. Akande, Mike Cooper,  
Karen Haslam, D. James Henderson, Tony Martin,  
Frank Miclash, Bill Murdoch, David Ramsay,  
Chris Stockwell  
Clerk/Greffier: Todd Decker

**Public accounts/Comptes publics**

Chair/Président: Joseph Cordiano  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Dianne Poole  
Gilles Bisson, Robert V. Callahan, Bruce Crozier,  
Robert Frankford, Rosario Marchese, Margaret Marland,  
Larry O'Connor, Stephen Owens, Anthony Perruzza,  
David Tilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Todd Decker

**Regulations and private bills/**

**Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair/Présidente: Christel Haeck  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Ellen MacKinnon  
Ron Eddy, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Pat Hayes,  
David Johnson, Leo Jordan, Gordon Mills, Hugh O'Neil,  
Anthony Perruzza, Tony Ruprecht  
Clerk/Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Resources development/Développement des ressources**

Chair/Président: Bob Huget  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Mike Cooper  
Sean G. Conway, Joan M. Fawcett, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp,  
Sharon Murdoch, Steven Offer, David Turnbull,  
Daniel Waters, Gary Wilson, Len Wood  
Clerk/Greffière: Tannis Manikel

**Social development/Affaires sociales**

Chair/Président: Charles Beer  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ron Eddy  
Jenny Carter, Dianne Cunningham, Randy R. Hope,  
Tony Martin, Dalton McGuinty, Larry O'Connor,  
Yvonne O'Neill, Stephen Owens, Tony Rizzo, Jim Wilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Douglas Arnott

These lists appear in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding and including ministerial responsibilities appears on subsequent Mondays.

Ces listes figurent dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et le premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions comprenant les responsabilités ministérielles paraît tous les lundis suivants.









# CONTENTS

Wednesday 6 April 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Young offenders</b>                 |      |
| Mr Morin                               | 5397 |
| <b>Commercial fishing</b>              |      |
| Mr Jordan                              | 5397 |
| <b>Eastwood Collegiate Institute</b>   |      |
| Mr Cooper                              | 5397 |
| <b>Interprovincial trade</b>           |      |
| Mr Ramsay                              | 5397 |
| <b>Ancillary fees</b>                  |      |
| Mrs Cunningham                         | 5398 |
| <b>Jobs Ontario Training</b>           |      |
| Ms Harrington                          | 5398 |
| <b>Transportation for the disabled</b> |      |
| Mr Murphy                              | 5398 |
| <b>Tartan Day</b>                      |      |
| Mr Murdoch                             | 5398 |
| <b>Cancer Month</b>                    |      |
| Mr Frankford                           | 5399 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| <b>Police services</b>         |      |
| Mr Bradley                     | 5399 |
| Mr Christopherson              | 5399 |
| <b>Emergency services</b>      |      |
| Mr Elston                      | 5400 |
| Mrs Grier                      | 5400 |
| Mr Miclash                     | 5401 |
| <b>Ontario Hydro agreement</b> |      |
| Mr Stockwell                   | 5401 |
| Mr Rae                         | 5401 |
| <b>Young offenders</b>         |      |
| Mr Harnick                     | 5402 |
| Mrs Boyd                       | 5402 |
| <b>Drivers' licences</b>       |      |
| Mr Murphy                      | 5403 |
| Mr Pouliot                     | 5403 |
| <b>Social contract</b>         |      |
| Mr Cousens                     | 5404 |
| Mr Laughren                    | 5404 |
| <b>Ministry relocation</b>     |      |
| Mr Malkowski                   | 5405 |
| Ms Swarbrick                   | 5405 |

## Agricultural funding

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Mrs Fawcett                            | 5405 |
| Mr Buchanan                            | 5405 |
| <b>Volunteer firefighters</b>          |      |
| Mr Runciman                            | 5406 |
| Mr Mackenzie                           | 5406 |
| <b>Commercial fishing</b>              |      |
| Mr Hayes                               | 5406 |
| Mr Hampton                             | 5406 |
| <b>Transportation for the disabled</b> |      |
| Mr Offer                               | 5407 |
| Mr Philip                              | 5407 |
| <b>Landfill</b>                        |      |
| Mr Tilson                              | 5407 |
| Mr Wildman                             | 5407 |

## PETITIONS

|                                      |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>            |      |
| Mr Morin                             | 5408 |
| Mr North                             | 5410 |
| Mr Callahan                          | 5410 |
| <b>Firearms safety</b>               |      |
| Mr McLean                            | 5408 |
| Mr Bisson                            | 5409 |
| Mrs Haslam                           | 5410 |
| Mr Offer                             | 5411 |
| <b>Photo-radar</b>                   |      |
| Mr Sorbara                           | 5409 |
| <b>Employment equity</b>             |      |
| Mr Arnott                            | 5409 |
| <b>Emergency service</b>             |      |
| Mr North                             | 5409 |
| <b>Tuition fees</b>                  |      |
| Mr Murphy                            | 5410 |
| <b>Gary Walker</b>                   |      |
| Mr Runciman                          | 5410 |
| <b>Cancer treatment</b>              |      |
| Mrs Sullivan                         | 5410 |
| <b>Health protection legislation</b> |      |
| Mr Tilson                            | 5411 |
| <b>Snow removal</b>                  |      |
| Mr Cleary                            | 5411 |

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Standing committee on government agencies, Mrs Marland</b>        |      |
| Mrs Marland  | 5411 |
| Report adopted   | 5411 |
| <b>Standing committee on regulations and private bills, Ms Haeck</b> |      |
| Ms Haeck   | 5411 |
| Report adopted   | 5411 |

## FIRST READINGS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Avian Emblem Act, 1994, Bill 147, Ms Murdock</b> |      |
| Ms Murdock  | 5412 |
| Agreed to   | 5412 |

## SECOND READINGS

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and French-language School Boards Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 143, Mr Philip</b> |                        |
| Ms Gigantes  | 5412, 5418, 5421       |
| Mr Chiarelli   | 5413, 5417, 5431       |
| Mr Bisson  | 5416, 5427             |
| Mr Daigeler  | 5416, 5420, 5421, 5426 |
| Mr David Johnson   | 5417, 5427             |
| Mr Mammoliti   | 5417                   |
| Mr Grandmaître   | 5420, 5425             |
| Mr White   | 5420, 5425, 5427       |
| Mr Sterling  | 5420, 5425, 5427       |
| Mr Stockwell   | 5425                   |
| Mr Murdoch   | 5426, 5427             |
| Mr Morin   | 5428, 5432             |
| Mr Philip  | 5431                   |
| Mr Poirier   | 5432                   |
| Mr McGuinty  | 5432                   |
| Debate adjourned   | 5433                   |

## OTHER BUSINESS

|                             |      |
|-----------------------------|------|
| <b>Visitor</b>              |      |
| Mrs Marland                 | 5399 |
| <b>Ministerial response</b> |      |
| Mr Offer                    | 5408 |
| <b>Non-profit housing</b>   |      |
| Mrs Marland                 | 5408 |

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 6 avril 1994

### PREMIÈRE LECTURE

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 sur l'emblème avien, projet de loi 147, M<sup>me</sup> Murdock</b> | 5412 |
| Adoptée   | 5412 |

### DEUXIÈME LECTURE

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant des lois concernant la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et les conseils scolaires de langue française, projet de loi 143, M. Philip</b> |      |
| M. Poirier   | 5432 |
| Débat ajourné  | 5433 |

120N  
X1  
-023

Government  
Publications



No. 109

N° 109

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 7 April 1994

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Jeudi 7 avril 1994



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

*50th anniversary*

*1944–1994*

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 7 April 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 7 avril 1994

The House met at 1000.

Prayers.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

### LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI CONCERNE L'AIDE SOCIALE

Mr Carr moved second reading of Bill 144, An Act to amend the Family Benefits Act and the General Welfare Assistance Act / Projet de loi 144, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations familiales et la Loi sur l'aide sociale générale.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Pursuant to standing order 96(c)(i), the honourable member has 10 minutes for his presentation.

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** I want to take a quick moment to thank the people over at legislative research who put together this bill for me and worked very hard on it.

I'll read out the intent in the explanatory note and then I'll get into some of the details.

This bill "amends the Family Benefits Act and the General Welfare Assistance Act to provide investigators with adequate powers to obtain information relevant to determining the eligibility of persons for assistance under those acts. It allows people to provide information even if it is confidential or privileged without fear of a proceeding being launched against them, as long as they do not act maliciously or without reasonable grounds for believing that the information they give is true."

The reason this bill was put in place, and it's similar to a bill that is now in place in Quebec, was to deal with the incidence of fraud in the welfare system.

I think it's important for the members to know that in the province of Ontario today we are now spending \$6.2 billion on welfare; it's projected to go to \$6.4 billion. To put that into perspective, in 1990 we were spending about \$2 billion.

One in nine people now in the province of Ontario is on welfare or social assistance.

That \$6.2 billion that we are spending is now more than we are spending for education. To put it in perspective, we pay more money for more people to be on welfare than we do to educate our children in the province of Ontario. I say to you that no society, whether it be Ontario or any jurisdiction, will be able to survive as long as that continues.

The reason I proceeded with this particular bill was as a result of the 1992 Provincial Auditor's report, which confirmed that there are insufficient mechanisms in place within the Ontario social assistance system to bring

welfare fraud and abuse under control and to recover lost welfare money. It was the auditor, in his report, who said that. During the public accounts committee hearings, the ministerial staff admitted that they have no statistical profiles on the full extent of welfare fraud or lost welfare payments.

According to the auditor, it could be as high as 10% of the \$6.2 billion spent on welfare that was inappropriately allocated either through fraud, ministry error or overpayment. Some people believe it's higher. Some people believe it may be as high as 20%. Some people believe it's as low as 3%, as they do in Metro. In Halton region, the people in the social assistance office believe that welfare fraud is as high as 10%. I suspect they probably have a better handle on it than anybody else, being the people on the front lines. So when you're talking about 10% of \$6.2 billion, you can see that the fraud and abuse is a substantial amount of money.

According to the auditor, no outstanding debts through overpayment or fraud were recovered by the government in a full 70% of the cases where they were reviewed. The reason given for this was because the ministry collection program relies on voluntary repayment, while legal recourse is not actively pursued. When we're talking about the dollars that we're talking about here, I firmly believe we must look at it aggressively.

In my own region of Halton, we had an individual who came and worked on looking for fraud. That individual was paid \$40,000. In one year, he saved Halton region about \$800,000. One man making \$40,000 saved us \$800,000.

When you look at the headlines—and over the last little while I looked through some of the papers. "Welfare Fraud Deluge."

"Provincial investigators can't keep up with the flood of welfare fraud cases." This is from the Toronto Sun, February 19. "Either welfare payments"—in 59% where they were caught—"were cut off or the claimant was persuaded to withdraw his application.

"Despite the boost in manpower, investigators can't keep up with the fraud investigations passed over to them."

A second one in the Toronto Sun, March 9, "Second Welfare Scam Foiled." "Welfare Duo Rips Off System." "Bogus Welfare Network Busted." Page after page of clippings talking about the fraud and abuse.

I don't suspect that this government will proceed with this bill; I'm under no illusions that it will pass. But I refer to a poll that was in the Toronto Star of January 18, and in that the Gallup organization asked people what they thought about this bill. The vast majority of Canadians, in fact 71%, approve of the welfare probes. The



vast majority of Canadians—actually it was higher in Ontario; it was 71% of Canadians, and in Ontario it was 76%—believed that the government has the right to verify information given out by people who get welfare payments. The Gallup organization asked 1,000 adults, “Do you think the government should have the right to verify information given out by welfare recipients, or do you think that such a verification represents an invasion of privacy?”

In Ontario, 76% of the people believe that the government has the right, and that’s what this bill does. Some 71% right across Canada believe that the government should be able to test the information, compared with just 24% who said they perceived the verification as a violation of a person’s civil rights. Some 4% of the respondents didn’t know.

1010

This is another case of bringing a bill before the Legislature where it has broad public support in the province of Ontario. I hear the laughs on the other side. Of course, I guess they don’t believe the polls. But in this case, in the province of Ontario, 76% of the people in this province believe this should be brought in. I say to the members opposite, the only poll, I guess, that’ll count is a year from now when the government puts its mandate forward.

We called for, I guess a year ago, some tightening of the welfare system. In our pre-budget report, we called for some procedures put in place. My colleague from Burlington South has put forward some of our options to deal with the incidence of welfare fraud and abuse. In fact, the government just as recently as last week has started to add more people to look for fraud in welfare in the system. I think two years ago they wouldn’t have done that. We are proud of being able to push this government in the right direction and I give them credit where credit’s due: on occasion they do listen to us.

We’ve called for certain things to be done to be able to take a look at the welfare fraud and abuse because in the auditor’s report, they found that the situation is that there isn’t adequate verification. As all of us know, people in need of financial assistance must first meet with a case worker to complete an application form. This information is used to determine the applicant’s eligibility and the amount of assistance. The case worker is required to inspect the document from the applicant for things such as birth certificate, rent receipts and so on. The auditor found that this information on which the payments were made was not always verified, either at the time of application or during the annual updates. That’s from page 37 of the 1992 auditor’s report.

So this isn’t me saying this about the verification process. The auditor basically said that if you go into social assistance and give them information, they don’t check on it, they believe you, and as a result, we are open for fraud and abuse and it’s happening.

The ironic thing about this whole situation, as we found out with the situation with this government, is there is not enough money right now in the system for the people who truly need it, for the people who are disabled through no fault of their own. Those people are

suffering because people are on social assistance who should not be. I say to this government, when it came in with all its self-styled, self-serving sensitivity towards welfare recipients, you were going to help the situation and everybody was going to be able to get taken care of. The fact is, you’ve had to hold the increases and one of the reasons you’ve had to is because there is so much fraud and abuse in the system, the people who truly want it can’t get it.

I appreciate the opportunity. I hope the government members will support this piece of legislation. I’m not under any illusion they will, but I firmly believe, unless this province moves to correct the blatant abuses and fraud that are occurring in the welfare system, it will soon be without the means to preserve the social system as we know it. This will result in a tragedy for those who truly require social assistance, especially during these tough economic times. Also, I think in these tough economic times the taxpayers who are shouldering the responsibility deserve much better accountability of their tax dollars. This bill will do it and I hope the members will support it.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Each party will have up to 15 minutes to debate Bill 144. Further debate?

**Mr Bob Huget (Sarnia):** First of all, let me say I’m pleased to have the opportunity to speak to this bill this morning. I want to let you know right from the outset that I will not be supporting this bill. I’m quite frankly confident that existing laws and procedures are adequate to ascertain and deal with eligibility or with any possible cases of fraud within the social assistance program. After reading this bill, I cannot possibly be in favour of giving such sweeping powers that would override any rights that individuals currently have in the system.

I’d like to share with the members of this House an incident that recently occurred in my community, and I want to share it with you in an attempt to help everyone understand the implications of such a bill as it relates to persons’ rights.

On November 24 of last year, Lambton county council, of which my community of Sarnia is a member, passed a motion directing the social services administrator to make available to the warden of the county a complete list of the names and addresses of all recipients of general welfare. The purpose of this motion, according to some members of council, was to warn the small percentage of people abusing the system that an elected official has access to the system, that knowing this would make people think twice before defrauding the welfare system. That motion was a breach of client confidentiality and, in my opinion, a very feeble attempt to address the issue of fraud.

The reaction from recipients in my community can be clearly seen in a letter written to me from a member of the Council of Consumers. The Council of Consumers, Madam Speaker, as you will know, is the advisory group to the Minister of Community and Social Services, made up of current and previous social assistance recipients. I quote from that recent letter:

“I have a close friend who is involved in an abusive

relationship. I almost had her convinced to go to the interval home. The last time I spoke to her she expressed concern that if she left, she would have to apply for welfare and didn't want to read her name on a welfare list in the paper, the post office or someplace else. I tried to assure her that such a thing would not happen. She clearly was not convinced.

"General welfare recipients are feeling very frightened and threatened and many are concerned with what will happen next. Most are too afraid to speak up for themselves for fear of bringing an investigation onto themselves."

The author of that letter feels that county council "has misused its power and must be held accountable."

Clearly, when such incidents occur, the anxiety felt by recipients shows that the action is not justified. Thankfully, the current warden, the new warden, has stated publicly that she has no intention of viewing the names. But the outgoing warden did view the names and addresses.

And what did it accomplish? Nothing. Nothing, that is, if you ignore the fact that it infringed on the rights of every person who was on that list or that it went against the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. But, to reiterate, the bottom line here is that it accomplished nothing positive.

And nothing, I'm certain, can be accomplished from this bill, unless, of course, you are comfortable with deeming social assistance recipients as second-class citizens and you are comfortable with ensuring that individuals cannot retain any privacy rights once they are on assistance.

In my constituency office, as I'm sure in many members' offices, I have heard from hundreds of people regarding social assistance. I hear complaints every day about suspected fraud, about the perception that people on welfare are lazy and about it being too easy to get on our assistance system. I strongly believe that the majority of those concerns and the majority of some of those negative perceptions can be dealt with through a massive public education system where the people of this province understand the system and understand how it works.

For instance, in Lambton county we have a full-time eligibility review officer. This officer investigates complaints about fraud under the General Welfare Assistance Act. Clearly, given this, there appears to be an adequate system in place to address the issue of fraud in my county. What could possibly be further accomplished by introducing the measures outlined in Bill 144?

As a society, we have undertaken to assist those who find they cannot support themselves. I believe we must also ensure that individuals can and do receive the respect they deserve and maintain their dignity while on assistance.

1020

It is my opinion that this bill does nothing to ensure the rights and dignity of individuals, nor does it provide any necessary means to address fraud. In fact, what this bill proposes threatens the fundamental rights of social assistance recipients, and particularly their privacy rights.

This government has undertaken to reform our social assistance programs to ensure that the program is administered as effectively as possible. There are other areas where we have worked to alleviate the financial strain on our social services budget. For example, Jobs Ontario alone has saved \$135 million from the province's welfare budget.

In closing, current legislative authorities—for example, the onus on the client to provide any information needed to maintain eligibility, the power to cancel benefits and the powers of the criminal law system—are more than adequate to deal with fraud in social assistance. There is no evidence that the broad powers proposed in Bill 144 are needed.

Further, there is no precedent in Ontario for this degree of power being exercised at such a low level in the daily administration of a program. It's interesting to note that in 1964, when the then Attorney General, Fred Cass, introduced the Police Amendment Act, which contained similar powers that were to be used by the police commission to address the more serious issue of organized crime, the ensuing controversy about the denial of civil rights forced the Attorney General to tender his resignation on March 23, 1964, 30 years to the day prior to the introduction of this Bill 144.

As I said in the beginning, I will not be supporting this bill. I refuse to support legislation that turns people in need into second-class citizens, that subjects people in need in this province to even more persecution and humiliation, and I will not take leadership and guidance from the third party, who now speak about New Directions, Volume Four—the road backwards.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I would like to address the issue which is raised by this bill this morning. I think the issue is timely. I find it unfortunate these days—well, it's not just these days; I've seen a trend since my beginning in the Legislative Assembly towards political agendas being used in this period reserved for private members' hours, the political agendas of political parties—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bradley:** No, I say that of all parties. I've seen that happen. Mr Jackson's been here a while; he would know as well that what we've gotten away from are individual members raising things that are of particular interest within their constituencies. I accept that, because all parties have participated in that. But I lament that fact, that this private members' hour has really now become a political forum, a straight partisan political forum. Perhaps it was inevitable that that happened, but I think there are individual problems that exist in a constituency that we should be addressing ourselves to. But this is before us and I think the member for Oakville has raised a legitimate issue, in my view, and that is the issue of fraud within a welfare system.

The Minister of Community and Social Services has indicated that he is aware that this does exist. He has indicated that he is going to hire—I don't know how this is going to happen; I suspect that you're not going to find that they're really the kind of investigators everybody thinks they're going to be. They'll likely be people who



will be bumped through the system, which has to happen within government; so you'll find that the people hired may not be the people who could best handle the job.

I believe that our goal is to try to get the assistance to those who are genuinely in need. My concern today is that it's difficult to do so. We're not in a boom economic time. We're unlikely to be back in that kind of time in the foreseeable future. Therefore, with the scarce resources that we have, I think we have to try to devote and narrow those resources to those who are genuinely in need. My concern is that the people who are genuinely in need are going to find that their level of assistance can't be as reasonable and as high as it could be because of the number of claims out there, some of which are less than legitimate.

We have to always remember that we're also in difficult economic times and that it is more difficult to find a job, particularly for younger people, naturally, but for older people who are out of the workforce who have been the victims of downsizing, for instance. The real way to solve this problem in the best of all worlds is to get people back to work, to create an atmosphere where jobs are created in this province. That would certainly be the goal I would strive for. I would hope it would be everyone's goal.

But to address the specific problem, I do want to discuss one aspect of it that I see as a real problem, and that is one I raised in the House with the minister in as moderate a manner as I could the other day; that is the issue of student welfare.

Once again, there is a legitimate program out there geared to young people who genuinely have a totally unacceptable circumstance at home. There may be continued physical abuse taking place or simply a totally chaotic situation at home. These particular young people, who want to continue their education through a program which has been established, are able to do so.

Unfortunately, a lot of abuse has crept into that program. What we're finding now, in talking to various people within the education system, is that a significant number of those students are simply not attending school, are not carrying out their responsibilities under the program.

The second problem is—and it must be very difficult for parents who have to go through this—that some of the kids use it as a lever against the parents. I get very concerned when I hear this. They simply don't like the rules at home, so a few of them will get together in an apartment and get the welfare. You'll get calls from the parents who are beside themselves over this, or parents may simply acquiesce, because the young people might make it so difficult at home that in fact the parents would sign and say there are irreconcilable differences.

My concern is that a legitimate program, a good program with good intentions, could be lost completely because of abuse. That's why it's important to remove the abuse. Similarly, in other forms of welfare, it is important to remove the abuse that might be taking place within the system.

At present, I don't think we have the levers to do it.

Whether this bill is the answer or not is open to question. The member for Oakville obviously feels that there is a genuine need to take some pretty drastic action. A lot of people out there would agree. These are people, often the working poor, who struggle on, who don't have the benefits that go with receiving welfare. I'm talking about health care benefits and things of that nature that go along with being on social assistance. They're beside themselves when they see themselves struggling at something just over the minimum wage and find themselves helping to pay the bill for others.

There is a problem out there. I think we have to take more drastic action than we would like to solve it. This bill goes in that direction. If it could be modified, if it could be changed in certain ways—and I'm sure the member is open to suggestions—then we would certainly be prepared to see that happen.

It's a legitimate complaint. I think we have to address it. I know that the member for Ottawa-Rideau is going to be assisting us in that regard.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I welcome this opportunity to comment briefly on the very important private member's bill brought before us today for consideration by the member for Oakville South.

Bill 144, An Act to amend the Family Benefits Act and the General Welfare Assistance Act, provides investigators with adequate powers to obtain information relative to determining the eligibility of people for assistance. It allows people to provide information, even if it is confidential or privileged, without fear of legal action, as long as they do not act maliciously or without reasonable grounds for believing the information they give is true.

I commend my colleague the member for Oakville South, because my constituents in Simcoe East tell me they are sick and tired of people ripping off the system when they themselves are struggling to survive on smaller paycheques or on fixed incomes.

**1030**

This is an important bill because the government is sitting on its hands and not dealing with important matters of concern to the people of Ontario. The government is leaving it to us, the PC caucus, to take the positive, effective and affirmative action necessary to stop the fraud and the waste. Welfare and family benefits fraud is a waste. The money is siphoned off. They steal our jobs and close our companies.

I want to make it clear that I know the majority of welfare families who receive benefits, the recipients, are truly in need. But I also know that there's always a small group of people who take advantage of and abuse our caring social assistance system. Many people in Simcoe East have told me they're shocked that over the years the overpayments to recipients of family benefits and welfare assistance in Ontario have passed the \$335-million mark.

Fraud and waste account for two types of overpayment. The first are collectible overpayments resulting from delays in reporting information, non-disclosure of information or misrepresentation of facts by recipients. These overpayments, if they are discovered at all, are recovered

from the recipient. The second are administrative overpayments resulting from errors on the part of the provincial, municipal or first nation governments that administer social assistance. Those overpayments are not collected but written off because the error was not the fault of the recipient.

Outstanding family benefits overpayments at the end of 1993 amounted to \$247 million, while outstanding welfare payments amounted to \$88 million. Write-offs totalled \$5.3 million in 1993-94.

Ontario taxpayers deserve and are demanding social service, workers' compensation and health care systems that are effective and accountable. Taxpayers understand better than most the need for government to provide services in an efficient, responsible and financially sound fashion. This is not occurring in many government agencies.

In the areas of health, welfare and workers' compensation, we don't have to look very hard to see where tax dollars are being lifted straight out of our pockets. Taxpayers have been shortchanged by a welfare and family benefits system that is fostering a stay-at-home attitude, and at the same time it is being ripped off. That's according to the auditor's report. The Provincial Auditor's report is telling us exactly what's happening.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services collects only 3% of all its outstanding welfare benefits. Social assistance expenditures have more than tripled over the last five years, it is expected the province will spend more than \$6.3 billion this fiscal year, compared to \$930 million 10 years ago.

The government must take positive, effective affirmative action to put a stop to the fraud and waste because it syphons our money, steals our jobs and closes our companies. The government must be willing to take a new direction, and we'll not only end up having more safety, fairness and equity in Ontario; we'll also have more workplaces with more jobs and more opportunities for the people of Ontario.

In these difficult times, taxpayers want the provincial government to provide good service to those who are truly in need. The passage of Bill 144 will go a long way towards aiding the government in providing services for those who are truly in need and put a stop to fraud and waste in the system. I commend the member for Oakville South for bringing this commonsense bill to our attention and urge everyone to support it.

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** We are told and have been reminded many times about the 42 years of wonderful government under the Tories in this province. I think this bill today demonstrates how that is such a myth and not the reality.

As they constantly remind us how wonderfully things were managed, we think of our health care system, where the costs of health care went up 10% a year during the 1980s. We think of the Workers' Compensation Board, which had an unfunded liability of about \$350 million at the beginning of 1980 and of course by 1990 was up to \$11 billion. We think of Ontario Hydro and its significant debt. We think of the people who express concerns about

our education system that is still working primarily on a system developed by the Conservative government. Then we come to the welfare system, again still on a basis of something developed by the Conservative government in 42 years.

It seems very clear to me that the health system wasn't managed, the Workers' Compensation Board wasn't managed, Hydro wasn't managed, the education system wasn't managed and the welfare system wasn't managed. Unfortunately, the Liberals had five years to deal with some of these things. We're not sure what they did in all those five years. They made some changes, but not significant changes.

Who's dealing with the health care system? We are. Who's dealing with the Workers' Compensation Board? Our government is going to take the tough decisions. Who's made the tough decisions and provided leadership at Ontario Hydro? Our government. Who's taking the leadership to put strong standards in the education system? Our government is. We are going to deal with the welfare system. Our government has dealt with that and we are going to reform that so it supports people and doesn't denigrate people, as this piece of legislation does.

It is very clear that for 42 years the Tories didn't manage any of the public services. They just let them be and thought they would take care of themselves. They need leadership. They need management. We're providing that. This bill does not.

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** I'm very pleased to participate in the debate on Bill 144, put forward by the member for Oakville South. In the letter sent to me by this member, he introduced his proposed legislation by stating that his bill would allow people to provide information even if it's confidential or privileged without fear of a proceeding being launched against them.

Bill 144, subsection 11.1(3) states that a person "may give the investigator information even if it is confidential or privileged and despite any act, regulation or other law prohibiting disclosure of the information." Wide, sweeping powers.

The member further suggests in his letter of March 31 that his proposed amendments would bring Ontario's social assistance system closer to Quebec's Boubou macoutes. Those who know and understand that system of verifying agents within Quebec are aware of painfully personal questions which are often pursued by the welfare police in that province and which are, more often than not, very intrusive and disturbing. Questions about the frequency and/or use of personal products and the contents of wrapped Christmas gifts have been cited by individuals who are under suspicion in that province.

The operative words here are "under suspicion." We are, I remind you, not speaking about questioning criminal activity. We're talking about questioning social assistance recipients. It seems unfair to me that the privileged and confidential information of those on social assistance should be viewed with less respect than the privileged and confidential information on you and I and every other member of this Legislature. This seems to be vindictiveness. It seems to be injustice against recipients of income support, many of whom are vulnerable and



disabled. Requesting, and perhaps in some cases compelling, third parties to disclose confidential and privileged information about their family members, neighbours, tenants, parishioners or friends seems to be an unconscionable invasion of privacy and personal dignity, and I think it is those things.

The essence of liberalism, even small-l liberalism, is the right of the individual to be protected against capricious actions by individuals, groups, institutions or the state. As my leader, the member for Fort William, has said, "It's not the role of government to direct and control people's lives but rather it is to create an environment in which people can solve problems for themselves."

Many, many individuals on social assistance realize they have a responsibility to contribute to the public good and they do. Some of them write letters to inform those who are less informed. I quote from one of those.

"We are not bums and freeloaders on the system, we are just human beings with feelings and souls. We are prisoners of an image created by a few who abuse the system. You are wrong about us. We need jobs."

1040

I believe, and I'm sure others believe, that we must exercise caution, extreme caution, before we embrace the adversarial investigative procedures which assume everyone is cheating the system until they can prove otherwise. Guilty until proven innocent, in my mind, is a new level of injustice.

Bill 144 completely overlooks, or should I say ignores, those who cheat the system through such avenues as participation in the underground economy, less than accurate reporting of their income on their income tax forms and insisting on exaggerated insurance settlements or workers' compensation claims. Then, of course, we have the cross-border shopper who smuggles, sometimes on a daily basis, and those who engage in tax-evasion deals when they're renovating their homes.

Perhaps this type of cheater is considered more respectable, more sophisticated, by the member for Oakville South. Perhaps these cheaters are not considered such an easy target, for they are members of our community who have arrived, who are secure. Instead of addressing this type of cheating, the member for Oakville South, like the Treasurer, has chosen to concentrate his efforts on what he sees as the easier target, the recipient of social assistance, a person who is often, at least for a time, vulnerable and disabled.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House the efforts of many of the municipalities in this province—some have been mentioned this morning—which are to be commended for weeding out the abusers within their own communities. They have not requested the extraordinary powers of Bill 144, but have achieved excellent results within the existing rules and regulations.

In Halton, for example, an eligibility review officer has been working for two years on verifications in that community. After the first year, a saving in excess of \$800,000 was reported and that position has been enhanced. In Thunder Bay, four existing investigators

have identified 200 complaints, 50 of which have court cases pending. In the Waterloo region, 228 cases were reviewed by the region's fraud unit; of these, 48 people were convicted of fraud.

Municipalities such as these can best pursue individual cases, have access to local networks and have firsthand knowledge of the most likely points of abuse in their own communities, whether these are multiple identities or unreported income.

But we now have a contest at Queen's Park, a contest based on sweeping pronouncements rather than hard evidence, a contest where no tactics are considered out of bounds, a contest that will increase appeals to the Social Assistance Review Board, a contest that is based on confusion, a contest where the prize is unknown. Who will become the captain of the fraud squad, the minister or the member for Oakville South?

I remind the House that the minister himself has stated, as late as last week at his press conference, that he has no proof of widespread welfare abuse. What we really need is real welfare reform in this province, welfare reform that was promised by this NDP government from day one but still has not arrived. What we don't need is a new captain of the fraud squad.

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I'm very pleased to follow the Liberal critic for Community and Social Services in this important debate this morning. She gave a very forthright and thoughtful speech, as she always does, but I'm left wondering again where the Liberal Party stands on this issue. Are they in favour of enhanced efforts to eliminate fraud in our social assistance system today in Ontario, or are they against enhanced efforts to eliminate fraud? Do they think that the level of fraud that's in existence today in Ontario is acceptable, or do they feel that something ought to be done about it to enhance the ability of our local social services agencies to deal with the problem?

There's no question where our party stands on this issue. We feel that the level of fraud in the welfare system today is unacceptable. We feel that the system needs to be revamped and we feel that strong efforts must be made in that direction so that public support and confidence in the welfare system can be maintained. Ultimately, we all accept the fact that there are going to be people who need our assistance, certainly people with physical disabilities who cannot physically work, as attested by a physician. We want to support them, we want to support them compassionately and generously, but we see examples where the system is abused, and that undermines public confidence and public support in our welfare system.

Last week, I raised in the House an issue that had come to my attention where a 16-year-old girl who lives in Wellington county was living in a self-contained apartment, paying rent to her parents, and applied for social assistance to our local social services department and was refused because there was no reason to give her welfare. She immediately appealed to the Social Assistance Review Board, which is her right and I don't dispute that, but the board, without assessing the merits of the case, without contacting our local social services

agency to inquire about it, instantly awarded interim assistance. As we know, we find that the Social Assistance Review Board is notoriously slow in dealing with appeals and it takes up to 12 months.

This individual right now is receiving welfare and that is wrong. It ought to be corrected. I asked the minister to do it, but I'm not sure what he's done. I spoke to him the next day requesting that something be done, and I doubt very much that anything has been done.

In terms of what we're doing with our welfare system, we've got to look at how we can enhance our local agencies that are there on the front lines to do the job. I think this bill does that and I want to give credit to my colleague the member for Oakville South for putting this bill forward, this Bill 144, because it's a good step in the right direction.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Essex—no, Chatham-Kent.

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** You've got to give more speeches in the House so we know who you are.

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** Somebody must have just flushed the toilet.

What I would like to do is comment on Bill 144. In the initial comments that were made by the member for Oakville South, I'd like to indicate he referred to the auditor's report about fraud. That auditor's report was done before 1990, and it indicated very clearly, from the then Deputy Minister of Community and Social Services, Charles Pascal, a number of initiatives that we were doing to make sure that support payments, UI eligibility, CPP eligibility and other eligibilities were there for persons on social assistance entitled to those programs. There was a mechanism put in place and that has become very positive.

We're talking about the titles that were indicated in newspapers. While there are a number of newspapers where people—I know the member from the Liberal caucus brought them up, about intrusion on women who have gone through emotional and also degrading circumstances in their homes when a review officer or any of the officers came into their homes in Quebec.

I would also like to indicate that the member for Oakville South indicated a person, who was hired at approximately \$40,000, must be the new eligibility review officer, put in place to deal specifically with these cases, but that review officer is also currently working under the laws that have been provided.

We are opposed to fraud in the system, but we believe that the mechanisms provided in the legislation are adequate powers to deal with fraud as well as non-fraudulent overpayment.

As a condition of receiving benefits, social assistance clients are under an obligation both on the initial application and on an ongoing basis afterwards to supply information that is necessary to establish or maintain eligibility. It also entitles around income, about assets, and all clients are required to sign consents to release information by third parties: schools, banks and other ministries.

It is in the client's interest to obtain the appropriate information to ensure continuing eligibility. Because of the consent signed by clients, there is little difficulty in obtaining the information required from the banks or employers. One of the things that was also indicated was that there is the obligation and there are criminal fines under the Criminal Code. If the amount involves more than \$1,000, the person can face up to 10 years in jail; those under \$1,000 are looking at imprisonment for under two years.

The eligibility review officers that this government has put in place are dealing with the issues that the general public are talking about as fraud, and we believe we are going at it the right way by not intruding in people's lives, allowing them to have the decisions that are there as dealing with a person.

1050

One of the things we must remember as we talk about the one point something million people on it is that we're talking about a number of children who are on social assistance and we're talking about a number of single parents, and I keep hearing "family of the 1990s." There are separations that occur and economic situations that we're in right now where people are losing their jobs, pressure is created in the homes and families disperse or split up.

We're talking about women who are out there in our communities with children, trying to provide. Some of them and probably most of them have never worked in their lives, but they are trying through initiatives like Jobs Ontario. I know in my community, and my colleague from Sarnia indicated about Jobs Ontario positively, I hear from people who want to get back to work, not be on social assistance.

What we're doing is the more positive way and we are looking at reforming this system. This system is old. But we must keep in mind the rights of the individual. My colleague indicated that back in 1964 a bill was removed and the member resigned. I believe what we're trying to do is not that approach, but a positive approach, understanding the economic situations and the situations of the families involved, with children involved, the community involved. I believe that through our eligibility review officers and the powers that are bestowed in the current legislation, and in future improvements that we'll be making, we will allow the individuals to have dignity and return back to work and we will get our financial situations under control.

I will not be supporting Bill 144 and I ask all my colleagues not to support it because of intrusion of rights of individuals.

**Mr Bernard Grandmaitre (Ottawa East):** I know what the member for Oakville South is trying to do, I think, but it's the wrong approach. I think what we need in the province of Ontario is welfare reform. The Tories have given up on the government. They've promised us welfare reform for a number of months now and they're acting on their own.

But I don't think we have to use these tactics to dig out the people who are abusing the system. I know that



we do have fraud in the system. I don't know if I can accept the 10% mentioned by the member for Oakville, but what we need are more social workers who understand what people are going through and also welfare reform in the province of Ontario.

**Mr Jackson:** I am very pleased to be able to rise in the House and deal with this issue, a bill put forward by my colleague from Oakville South which deals with the very important issues of accountability and good management of taxpayers' resources in this province.

Quite frankly, I am shocked at some of the comments coming from the Liberal benches. The Liberals indicated that what we need are more social workers and that what we need is social assistance reform. It was the Liberals who invested millions and millions of dollars in a study called Transitions, which was an outstanding blueprint for reform, and then did absolutely nothing with it. What they then did was they proceeded to create some regulatory changes like no longer doing home visits and inspections, like suggesting that the system be opened up and be more accessible.

The laissez-faire attitude of Liberals and their inability to manage the system is well known. I am not surprised that the Liberals would stand in the House today and say, "We've got to hire a bunch more civil servants, but we're not going to give them the tools to do their job for the taxpayer." My colleague from Oakville South has prepared and presented a bill. It may not be a perfect bill, but it's a start. It's the first bill of its type in this province which says we had better empower our civil servants to do the job they're being asked to do, to be accountable with the moneys that are being spent, taxpayers' money, for those in need in this province.

I am also confused at the Ontario Liberal Party's condemnation of the Liberal government in Quebec which has the capacity to manage its province, because that Liberal government brought in the same legislation proposed by my colleague from Oakville South, but Liberals speaking out of both sides of their mouths is not new.

The truth of the matter is that the Liberal government of Quebec said that there's too much fraud going on in its welfare system. Their statistics prove that empowering their civil servants to raise certain questions and do certain investigations assisted them immensely.

In Quebec they did something very interesting, because unlike their Ontario counterparts, they also were compassionate with the results of their efforts. They were allowed to increase support for those in need in Quebec because they took it from those who didn't need it and were taking it illegally, improperly or because of computer errors or whatever. So at least the Quebec government under the Liberals put some of that additional money into the hands of social assistance recipients.

To listen to the NDP about management, I'm not even prepared to comment. We know they have brought in major changes to social assistance to make the system more widely used without making it equally accountable.

I want to suggest a couple of things. When this government took over, there were about 600,000 recipi-

ents on social assistance; there are now 1.2 million. Now the government is announcing that it's going to hire a whole bunch of additional civil servants to go and do the reviews that should have been done three years ago.

If you look at the average case load being taken over by a social worker in this province, it's about 300 recipients to one case worker. You cannot manage a system with that ratio. It's impossible to keep proper controls on that system. Now, at the 11th hour, by the minister's own admission, the fraud he hopes to recover is \$100 million at least. He's finally admitting to that. That's the kind of money he could have been saving three years ago had he listened to Mike Harris and the Conservative caucus when we began raising the issue of a system which wasn't being managed properly. You didn't give the civil service the tools to do its job and now you're criticizing the civil service for not having done its job. It was your government's responsibility to do it and you chose not to assume that responsibility.

I heard the government say that the current system of prosecuting fraud is working. I'll tell you a case I recently brought to the attention of the justice minister. I had a case of a social assistance recipient whose ex-husband was not making his child support payments. When that went to court, the province of Ontario wrote off \$25,000 in back payments and cut a deal in court to reduce the amount of child support payments this individual would have to pay to the woman on social assistance. I took it directly to the Attorney General, who explained to me in complex terms that there's nothing very much her government could do.

The number of cases going to court in this province is minimal, because the current practice in this province is that if fraud is discovered, the simple defence is, "No one told me that if my husband returned and moved in with us, I was no longer eligible for welfare." That's what's going on.

This government is going to invest millions of dollars hiring a bunch of civil servants to get on the telephone and ask people: "Who's living with you today? Do you have any extra income? Do you have any more children?" If they get the right answers, that's the end of it.

What my colleague from Oakville South is indicating is what municipalities in this province have been telling us, that freedom of information laws, right here in the city of Toronto, are preventing the social assistance office from telephoning down the hall to ask the public utilities commission if the person who put the deposit on that apartment is the same person collecting social assistance. A simple phone call like that is against the law in this province.

In Quebec they said: "That's ludicrous. You're tying our hands. We can't do our job." There are municipalities that support this bill because in Quebec it's working. The proof of it is that we've had a huge increase of Quebec residents drawing welfare cheques in eastern Ontario as a direct result of the accountability tests that have been occurring in that province.

The bottom line is that this may not be the total solution to the problem, but we have got to provide

legislation which will provide the new civil servants that this government's hiring to do these checks of welfare recipients, to allow them to ask the appropriate questions.  
1100

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. The member for Oakville South has two minutes to conclude.

**Mr Carr:** I appreciate all the members who participated in the debate. Very briefly, I say to the member for St Catharines, who spoke about it being political, this was not political. We don't decide what to do. I decide what I'm going to bring forward. I don't discuss it with anybody else. When I picked this position, I decided it was going to be something that I believed in, and I believe welfare fraud and abuse should be stopped in the province of Ontario. I brought it forward because Gary Carr wanted it, not because the PC Party of Ontario wanted it.

To the member for Ottawa-Rideau, the critic for Comsoc: Here you are; you talk about welfare reform. Would you people take a position on something? Would you take a position on one thing? You want all the fraud to be eliminated, but when something's brought forward to do it, you won't support it. The fraud is going to drop from the heavens and end because you say so.

The Liberal Party in this Legislature wants to eliminate fraud and abuse in the welfare system, yet they won't support anything that's brought forward. It was brought forward by a Liberal government in Quebec, just like a Liberal government in New Brunswick has had to take tough measures, because when you get in power, you have to make the tough decisions, you can't walk the fine line and sit on the fence in opposition. That's why the people of the province of Ontario are cynical, because of politicians like the member for Ottawa-Rideau.

The people out there, the abusers, are laughing at us. The abusers are laughing at us in this Legislature for not taking these messages.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. Members come to order.

**Mr Carr:** The workers at the social assistance offices are frustrated that they don't have the powers to eliminate the abuse. The taxpayers are being ripped off and every member of this Legislature who doesn't support this bill is helping the taxpayers being ripped off in the province of Ontario, and it's wrong and you should all be ashamed of yourselves.

**The Acting Speaker:** The time for this ballot item has expired. A vote will take place at noon.

AVIAN EMBLEM ACT, 1994

LOI DE 1994 SUR L'EMBLÈME AVIEN

Ms Murdock moved second reading of Bill 147, An Act to designate an Avian Emblem for Ontario / Projet de loi 147, Loi désignant l'emblème avien de l'Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Pursuant to standing order 96(c)(i), the member has 10 minutes for her presentation.

**Ms Sharon Murdock (Sudbury):** Matthew Conroy is the reason that I'm bringing forward this bill today: Matthew Conroy and about 5,196 other children in this

province who made an effort to contribute to something that they wanted to see.

Matthew Conroy, in December 1987, was one of the many nine-, 10- and 11-year-olds who answered the call of Vincent Kerrio, the then Minister of Natural Resources. The ministry had put out a request:

"Ontario has an official flower"—which is the trillium—"an official tree"—which is the white pine—"and an official mineral"—which is the amethyst—"but there is one emblem we lack, which most other provinces have. That's an official bird.

"I am asking youngsters aged nine to 11 to help fill that gap by participating in a contest to choose an official bird for Ontario." That's what the minister asked for.

"Birds are a significant part of Ontario's natural heritage. They play an important role environmentally, and provide hours of enjoyment to people like myself, who like to watch them," he said.

"All types of birds, such as waterfowl, songbirds, game birds and birds of prey should be considered for the emblem.

"The contest is part of the province's Wildlife '87 activities marking the 100th anniversary of the founding of Canada's first wildlife sanctuary."

That was dated December 10, 1987.

On August 23, 1988, MNR's news release under the then Liberal government state:

"The common loon was the overwhelming choice of children who entered a contest to recommend a provincial bird, Natural Resources Minister Vincent Kerrio announced today.

"More than 1,000 entries, out of a total of 5,195, suggested the loon.

"The children have told us their preference and it's a wonderful choice," and I emphasize "The children have told us their preference." "I'd like to thank all the youngsters who took the time to send in their suggestions. Judging by the interest and the effort they put into the contest, it looks like the future of our natural resources is in good hands."

Mr Kerrio also said that his parliamentary assistant would be introducing a private member's bill.

Matthew's eloquent explanation of the loon's unique attributes won him top honours for the contest. For the record—I know it's in the Hansard for 1988, but I'm going to read it again for the benefit of those members present:

"Hi, my name is Matthew Conroy. I am 10 years old and I live near Lively. My dad showed me the news release about naming a provincial bird and I have a suggestion for Ontario's official bird. I think it should be the loon.

"We live on a lake and in the summer we spend time fishing and canoeing. That gives us lots of chances to hear and see loons. I love to see them when they have their little loons with them. On land, they look so funny when they walk. When we are fishing or tenting, the call of the loon makes me tingle all over.

"I looked up some interesting things about loons that



would make it perfect for our official bird. It is the most ancient of Canadian birds. The loon is 'deliberately designed as a fish-catching machine,' and Ontario has lots of lakes and fish. They are a big, impressive black and white bird that almost everyone recognizes when they see it and certainly when they hear it.

"My dad says that they could be killed by acid rain since the pollution kills the fish that they eat. Maybe if we use the loon as our bird, it will help fight this pollution.

"I hope the official bird for Ontario becomes the loon."

That was written on December 29, 1987.

The media of the day, when it was announced in August 1988, made much of the selection. The choice of the loon and the selection of the winner, Matthew, were discussed by all of the leading papers, all of the dailies in the province. Of course in my area we had the Sudbury Star; the North Bay Nugget had it on the front page. The Manitoulin Expositor and the Walden Weekly, which is the paper for the Lively area, all covered Matthew's story.

But it isn't just Matthew's story; it is the story of the school children of this province feeling that choosing an avian emblem for Ontario was important enough to write in with their explanations. On Tuesday, August 23, 1988, the Minister of Natural Resources under the Liberals felt that it was an important enough decision to fly from Toronto to Sudbury to present Matthew personally with a beautiful limited-edition print by a famous artist, Michael Dumas.

Matthew also got an unexpected helicopter ride from Science North to the airport and back. But he also—and if you remember that day, and I'm sure many of us don't because it's not, in my view, all that important—had to compete for the front page of the Sudbury Star with Prince Andrew and Fergie's wedding, and he made it to the front page of the paper.

Matthew also thinks it's important enough that he, his mother, his father and his aunt came down from Sudbury today; they're sitting in the members' gallery. His sister—

*Applause.*

**Ms Murdock:** Wait, I'm not finished. His sister came from Guelph. They think it's an important enough thing that they should be here, so I welcome them.

1110

Matthew Conroy represents all of the children of this beautiful province. His selection of the loon as an emblem to represent Ontario's beauty, its wilderness and its environmental fragility is today believed to be the provincial bird.

After the presentation to Matthew, the Liberals introduced first reading on May 23, 1989, and second reading came on June 15, 1989. It is now April 7, 1994, and the loon is still not the official bird of Ontario.

There has been plenty of time to offer the public the opportunity to dissent from the loon if they didn't want it. No one has. The Progressive Conservatives, in 1983, put forth an Avian Emblem Act where they wanted the

blue jay, but unfortunately Prince Edward Island had already selected the blue jay so the bill did not go through, and I understand that. But there's no rational explanation as to why the loon is still not the official bird of Ontario.

The people of Ontario believe our bird is the loon. Tourists who come to our province don't even question it, because wherever they go, whatever store they enter, whatever parkland they see, the loon is prominently displayed on sweatshirts, pins and logos.

I'm not speaking today about why the loon should be the bird of Ontario. I think the loon is a given. It's, as they say in law, *res ipsa loquitur*. My emphasis today is that the children were asked to choose our avian emblem. They did that. Now, as teenagers, they are still waiting for it to be made official, finalized, confirmed. I think what this is saying to the children of our province who took the time to enter—they are now sitting here wondering why the process and the system hasn't worked, why this is not the official bird.

I think that it's important for us here today, and for the rest of the people who are watching the channel, to confirm to our children in this province that what we do in this House does have relevance and is worth their time. I'm hoping that I will have the support of all the House when it comes time to vote.

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** I too want to welcome Matthew Conroy to the Legislature, and his family too. There's one lesson you must have learned, Matthew: that to have any legislation, it takes a long time. I think today what you're going to see is a very unusual situation where I think all three parties will be supporting that. I can't speak for the Conservatives, but I know of their love for nature and their love for Canada and Ontario. Naturally, we'll support this legislation, and I will be supporting this legislation.

I recall, Matthew, that in 1989 I was in the House then, and a wonderful, passionate and dedicated member of Parliament at the time, Mr Ballinger, had introduced his private member's bill and how excited he was about this. He was excited and so were many of us, because, as the member from Sudbury stated, it was the children who had participated and the children who had decided that this should be our bird, our symbol for Ontario.

I am from a riding where the beauty and the nature of the Rouge Valley have made an impression not only on Canada or on Ontario or the surrounding country but over the whole world, for us to appreciate the environment and also to appreciate the natural surroundings of what the world has to offer us, and I too have become very sensitive to that situation.

You know, when I heard about this avian emblem for Ontario, it said something more. It says to me, "Listen to the children." Of course, as the member from Sudbury stated, it was the children themselves who had said, "This is the way to go; this is the bird," and not only saying that; they put it in words.

Matthew knew that the competition he was in was extremely difficult because not only he, who had expressed so eloquently why we should have this bird

and, as a matter of fact, the role that it plays in our nature, but there was a wonderful person too by the name of Erica Fowlie from Deep River, who was so inspired and so moved by the loon and the cry of the loon that a poem was written.

It was stated already in Hansard, but I will read it again because not only the written word but, I think, the sound of the word and the music within this poetry will move all of us to support this legislation and not be in any way taking partisan views of it.

The loon is my choice,  
Mostly because of its voice.  
He's one of Ontario's most ancient birds,  
Whose wild yodelling by early explorers was heard.  
His call chilled their blood in the dead of night,  
But he mocked them by laughing at dawn's first light.  
He's found throughout Ontario's rivers and lakes,  
His black and white plumage a chequered picture he makes.  
This powerful diver winters in coastal seas,  
As well as the Great Lakes in Ontario, if you please.  
Back home in spring comes our wandering loon,  
His haunting call we'll hear very soon.  
On the Canadian coin for all of us to see,  
This bird I do love and is special to me.

I'm sure many have, as I have, sat on the dock or by the water of the lake and watched the loon—this goes on—and the symbol and the impression that it brings to us all. That bird also exemplifies how we should treat nature. By studying that bird, it tells us how sensitive and delicate nature is. But if we have no respect for the environment, eventually the death of the bird will come.

I remember too that I heard an Indian, a native person, state in a speech one day that the land is our mother and we should never in any way abuse our mother because, in itself, that's one of the worst crimes any human being could ever do. If we abuse the land and abuse the water, we abuse the bird and we abuse ourselves. That cycle of nature that this represents tells us that to be sensitive to the loon is to be sensitive to life.

I think there is no other bird, in fact, that could exemplify life and existence for all mankind, birdkind, or any nature, in itself, that this bird exemplifies in that form. It seems to me, as I started and I stated: Listen to the children. Because the fact is, we may many times in this House debate all types of legislation, and if we bring it down to the simplest form and listen to the children, they have said this bird itself is the bird of life.

Of course, as you know, it's on our coins, and on those coins sometimes we have mocked the loonie and what have you. But to go deeper, it forces us to understand what's happening. Not only in this example will we listen to the children, because they've asked that the avian emblem as the loon be recognized in Ontario, but I think there is more for us to start listening to our children. As I said, I don't want to make this political, but at times if we step back a bit for a moment in the heat of debate, in the heat of partisan interaction, there is a message that can be said by the—I don't want to call it a simple language, but very plain language and direct language to us as adults.

This bird represents more than just being on the coin or just being mocked. It forces us to understand nature. It forces us to understand life. It forces us to come together as one. The last straw that is being put to this wonderful legislation is the support of all parties, of all individuals here, who will speak of course about the loon.

The northern people are blessed much more than, I would say, we here in the suburbs, where at times we cover the land with a lot of concrete and drive away many of nature's beautiful things to appreciate. So they themselves can listen to the loon much more than I. But again, thank the gods, whoever they are, whoever she be, that the gods have blessed Scarborough North with the Rouge Valley. At times we can hear some of those natural things, and at times, of course, we can hear the loon. It's one of the few places, Matthew, that we can ever come to, and one day, of course, I'll invite Matthew and the Speaker, who's a lover of nature too, who will come to the Rouge Valley and not only appreciate the fact that the loon will sing to you, sir, but will sing to all of us so that we should come together, should recognize nature, appreciate nature and appreciate, all of us, that life does not only exist in human beings, but exists in the water, in the air, in the trees and all the animals and birds around us so we become one. That's the fortunate situation that I have in Scarborough North.

1120

Even today, we appeal to the government of the day and the present government to save the Rouge Valley, to put sufficient money and funds there so that we can maintain that, so the singing of birds and the watching of the deer and the trees and the walk and the good smell of the flowers can continue for us to enjoy, not from a mind point of view but from a health point of view.

If we do pollute and destroy those natural things of life, we're destroying life as a whole. Life does not only exist with us, all-powerful man or all-powerful woman, as we destroy and cut trees and pollute the waters and pollute the air. But to pollute or destroy one or the other is to destroy life in its entirety.

So I say to the Matthews and Ericas, who have written such beautiful verse and brought to our attention to appreciate things more as we hurry through our life and getting material things, to understand the simple things of life, that life begins there and the cycle continues.

As I speak on the private member's bill, I don't speak completely for my party. But many of the members, who are now in meetings, support this legislation and want to say: "Thank you, children. Thank you all for reminding us what life is all about." So we support that.

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** I'm pleased this morning to have the opportunity to speak on the second reading of this act to designate an avian emblem for Ontario. As most of you know, this emblem we are speaking of is the *Gavia immer*, or common loon.

I would like at this time to also officially recognize our visitors in the gallery, especially Matthew, and say that I will be supporting this bill.

This morning, we have been given an opportunity to discuss symbolism. We are talking about the creation of



an emblem of something that is above and beyond common politics, of something that represents the great province and not its politicians or its politics.

I know this government is all too happy to divert attention away from itself and on to symbols. Perhaps for their sake this is a wise use of their time in the Legislature, because if we were to discuss a bird which truly portrays the government, I think it would be more fitting to choose Daffy Duck.

But in fairness, we are talking about Ontario's symbols, which in every case are signified by a natural resource of the province. Ontario's floral emblem is the trillium. The white pine is our tree emblem, and our provincial mineral is the amethyst. By designating the loon as our wildlife official symbol, we will have a more complete representation of Ontario's many natural resources.

To put this debate in perspective, we should examine the history of efforts to designate an official bird in the province. This history takes us back to 1983, when the Conservative government of the time tried to designate the blue jay as the official bird in Ontario. This ruffled the feathers of opposition members such as the member for Renfrew North, who bitterly opposed the legislation and condemned it as a waste of time. The blue jay was never adopted by the province, and the matter of an avian emblem was not to arise again until 1987, during the Liberal administration.

Ironically, the party which had thought such issues were a waste of time spent a great deal of time and money on the designation of an avian emblem. The Liberals vigorously tackled the Ontario bird issue by spending taxpayers' loonies on a province-wide contest and public relations campaign. Despite all these efforts, Ontario is still one of the two provinces without an official bird.

In 1987, the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters made the loon its symbol. They chose the loon because it is sensitive to environmental changes and reflected the OFAH's strong commitment to conservation. That makes this bill a little ironic in that here we have these thoughts coming forward from the member for Sudbury, and at the same time the government is cutting back on funding to the conservation authorities across this great province. The conservation authorities have offered many solutions on how to save money and still provide the necessary regulations for conservation, but they have yet to be listened to by this government. The symbol chosen by the OFAH is most fitting and true to the nature of its resource management.

The common loon is a bird which truly represents Ontario's natural heritage. As Canada's most ancient bird, the loon has been around for over 20 million years. Native Canadians have looked to the loon as a spiritual symbol. One Cree legend claims that the lonely wail of the loon is the echo of the cry of slain warriors calling back to the land of the living.

Unlike most birds, which have air-filled bones to make flight easier, the loon has solid bones that enable it to dive to depths of 30 metres to catch fish. Although the loon requires a quarter of a kilometre runway to become

airborne, it can reach speeds of up to 100 kilometres an hour when it takes flight. For the most part, the loon spends its time in the water, except when nesting or migrating.

The loon's summer breeding range spans from Iceland to Greenland, Alaska, the northern US and almost all of Canada. In a geographical sense, the loon is truly a national bird.

The loon has also etched its way into the hearts and minds of all Canadians through our monetary system now that its likeness is on our \$1 loonie. The loon design for the Canadian dollar was really introduced by accident when in 1987 the Royal Canadian Mint misplaced the original voyageur design which was originally chosen for the 11-sided coin.

It is no coincidence that Ontarians have traditionally chosen natural resource symbols to represent their province, for Ontario always had a vibrant resource economy, an economy which built this province and an economy which should be able to sustain this province. I would urge the government, and especially the Minister of Natural Resources, to step back and take a look at some of the policies, bills and regulations that he's been bringing through that are turning our natural resource industry away from the economic status that it once enjoyed.

1130

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** I'm very pleased today to rise in support of second reading of Bill 147, the Avian Emblem Act. As we know, and has been commented here, this bill has been revived from the past government.

Back in 1987, the Minister of Natural Resources held a contest among children nine to 11. There were 5,195 entries and of these, 1,000 children suggested the loon. It was announced in April 1988 during National Wildlife Week that the loon would soon be proclaimed as the provincial bird. Matthew Conroy's elegant explanation of the loon's unique characteristics won him top honours in the contest for the best entry.

I'm sure there are some people who wonder why we would need an official bird, but as has been pointed out, we have the trillium as the official flower, the white pine as the official tree, the amethyst as the official mineral. I think Matthew Conroy says it all in his letter to the Minister of Natural Resources where he expressed the reason why he felt the loon should be recognized as the official bird. I just want to quote from his letter:

"My dad says that they"—the loon—"could be killed by acid rain since the pollution kills the fish they eat. Maybe if we use the loon as our bird, it will help fight this pollution."

It is true that the loon could become endangered by this type of environmental hazard. In 1972 the population was in serious decline because of the environmental problems such as caused by the use of DDT, a pesticide which has since been banned.

Another problem is the use of the motor boats on lakes. After the chicks are born, they need to be taught how to swim, and because of the wave caused by the

boats some of the chicks are drowned before they are able to swim. Through public awareness, many cottagers learned of this problem and have formed cottage associations which have been able to alleviate the problem to a certain degree. Fortunately, back in 1974 there was an early spring and an increased number of chicks learned to swim before the cottagers arrived. Although these particular instances have been addressed, for the most part the species is still on the decline because of their sensitivity to existing similar conditions due to our other harmful pesticides causing pollution in the food chain.

It's important that our children learn about Ontario's wildlife and natural resources and the contribution they make to our own personal health and welfare as well as the natural environment, the important role they play in sustaining healthy ecosystems. The more children are able to learn about our environment, the more likely they will want to protect it by using resources wisely.

I think when the children choose the loon as the provincial bird, they choose it wisely. It's an interesting bird and being part of the oldest bird family in the world, it has been around for more than 20 million years. It can fly up to 100 kilometres per hour.

Isolated lakes attract the loon. That is why Ontario's more northerly lakes are found to be sufficient habitat for them as well as a sustainable breeding range. The loon spends most of its time in the water except when nesting and migrating. Nesting occurs during May, June and July.

Loons have proven to be devoted parents. One of the mates must always watch over throughout the 29-day incubation period of the eggs. After the chicks hatch, they are usually in the water swimming around within one day. They are self-sufficient by the time they are six weeks old and can migrate by 11 weeks.

The winter migration occurs in October and November. They often spend the winter travelling on the water in large groups. During this time, they head for destinations along the Atlantic coast, from Newfoundland to the Florida Keys, and along the Gulf of Mexico from Florida to Texas, along the Pacific coast from southern Alaska to California. When they return in early spring they split up into pairs. Often, there's only one nesting pair on a lake. Although the male and female partners do not always winter or migrate together, they usually return to the same nest site each year.

The loon has also been noted for its striking beauty. Male and female loons have identical and distinctive markings; adults in summer plumage have glossy black heads, black and white necklaces and chequered backs.

Many of the top 10 winners of the contest commented on these characteristics and felt that they were representative of some of Ontario's greatest strengths.

I'd like again to say that I support this bill.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I welcome the opportunity to comment briefly on the private member's bill that would designate the common loon as Ontario's official provincial bird, and I commend the member for Sudbury for bringing this legislation forward.

The loon is a migratory aquatic bird found in both fresh and salt water and in colder regions of the province.

Even where I live on Lake Couchiching, we see the bird quite often. The bird is a swift flyer, a strong swimmer and an adept diver. The common North American loon, or Great Northern Diver, is a black and white bird about 22 inches in length.

Designating the common loon as Ontario's official bird is an issue that the member for Sudbury wants us to debate and deal with here today. I remember back in 1983 speaking on the same issue in this Legislature. The member from Peterborough—I believe it was the Peterborough area—Jim Pollock, brought the resolution through to have the blue jay designated as the official bird. There are probably many other birds that people would like to designate, but the loon to me today appears to be the one that most people would like to see.

This edition of Ontario Outdoors has a beautiful picture in it of loons, and there are two full pages regarding stories about "the enchanting moonlight world of the mysterious loon."

I've been informed that loons mate for life. They raise their young, they stay together as a family and they stay together, as I said, for life. If one mate passes away and if the other one does remate, then they will mate for life again.

I see what the federation has done with regard to the emphasis that it's putting on the shirts that it sells. It was in 1987, I believe, that they adopted the loon as their official emblem. There's been a lot of excitement with regard to the emphasis on the loon. Last year there was a group of people, volunteers, who got together to organize the Orillia Waterfowl Festival. The Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, in cooperation with the community, had a waterfowl festival in the city of Orillia on October 15, 16 and 17. In cooperation with regard to the community, the volunteers had visited other parts of the country.

The Eastern Maryland Waterfowl Festival is where Canadian artists join their counterparts from around the world to display and sell their works. The craftsmanship that goes into making and doing the art, the creative work that goes into painting the loons, the pictures of the loons with the beautiful black and white, is something to be admired.

I think it's fitting that we designate the loon as the official bird, because I remember reading when the trillium was made Ontario's official flower. Every May, if you go into the bush, and I go into the bush at the back of my farm, it is beautiful with those trilliums. I think it was fitting that happened. When we look at the many aspects of creating and designating something special, I think this is very important.

**1140**

I want to just speak a little about the waterfowl festival, because it all fits in. Carvers come there from all over, from the States. It's becoming a major festival in the city. I believe that the loon stands out as the main attraction. They have arts, they have crafts, there are sculptors, carvers, artists, authors. They gather resources for local and national conservation projects.

I believe that events like the Orillia Waterfowl Festival



will go a long way towards educating the public that our wetlands are a critical component of the natural environment. Wetlands are vital to Ontario's economy because they maintain and improve water quality, help control flooding, provide a habitat for fish and wildlife, and contribute substantial social and economic benefits.

I just wanted to put those comments on the record this morning because to deal with this very issue is something nice for a change. It's something that I hope will become official because then we'll be able to recognize the loon. When I look out my window on to Lake Couchiching and see them there, they are to be admired, and I compliment the individuals who are here this morning to witness this debate that's taking place. Thank you for your efforts and your letters.

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I'm most pleased to participate this morning in the debate of the member for Sudbury's bill to make the loon the avian symbol of Ontario.

I think it's most appropriate to begin with sincere thanks to Matthew Conroy for his interest in the original 1987 contest and his concern for the environment. I believe that thanks must also be extended to Matthew's family. Clearly, Matthew's awareness of some of the problems faced by all the creatures of the earth, including the loon, is a result of family concern and interest.

It's very important for all of us to listen very carefully to Matthew's message and the message sent by the more than 5,000 children who responded in 1987 to the Ministry of Natural Resources contest. They want an Ontario where the lakes, rivers, air and soil are clean and able to sustain life, and they have the right to expect a healthful environment.

The loon has been described as a barometer of environmental health, and there is some evidence that its breeding success may be lessened on lakes affected by pollutants such as acid rain. Loons, like all living creatures, will be hard pressed to survive in acid-ridden lakes and chemically damaged waterways.

Ontario has the fifth-largest source of fresh water in the world. It's a tremendous resource and we're most fortunate, but with that good fortune comes tremendous responsibility. We have an obligation, as a people, as a government, to address issues like acid rain and chemical dumping into our lakes, soil and air.

We are also obliged to make progress in the fight to end such contamination. Some of that progress includes the issuance in 1993 of clean water regulations for the petroleum and pulp and paper industries. Draft regulations for the metal mining, industrial minerals and metal castings sector were released for public review in 1993.

Finalization of all these regulations will improve the water quality of all of our lakes, reduce persistent toxic compounds by up to 90% of their 1990 levels, reduce organochlorines, a family of chlorine-based chemicals that includes known cancer-causing agents, and protect human and aquatic health, and perhaps, Matthew, helps to preserve the food supply of loons and other species dependent upon fish stocks for survival.

Another initiative that helps preserve water quality is

the investment by the Ontario government to upgrade and build water and sewage treatment plants. Between 1990 and March 1993, the Ontario government invested \$538.5 million to improve treatment plants, \$258 million in 1993 through Jobs Ontario Capital for new construction and upgrades to treatment plants and has set aside an additional \$350 million for 1994-95.

The new Ontario Clean Water Agency, and I know the Conroys are familiar with that, will help Ontarians to develop the water and sewer infrastructure we will need in the future if we are to continue to be successful in our collective efforts to eliminate and clean up existing pollution and prevent pollution in the future.

I'd like to also speak briefly to the issue of acid rain. Despite the fact that as much as 50% of the acid fallout on Ontario comes from the US, it's incumbent upon us in Ontario to do our part to reduce and eliminate acid rain if we're ever to persuade American legislators to move ahead with acid rain controls. One step in that direction was the decision in September 1992 to ban future construction of municipal solid waste incinerators. The province also placed more stringent performance requirements on existing incinerators.

The air emissions from incinerators are a potential threat to both human health and the environment. Incinerators generate a wide variety of toxic heavy metals and organic contaminants. They also emit waste gases that cause smog, global warming and acid rain. Even when equipped with the latest state-of-the-art emission controls, solid waste incinerators release a wide range of chemicals, like dioxins and furans, mercury, arsenic and cadmium. These pollutants may travel hundreds of kilometres before they drift to the ground, settling on our homes, soil, crops, farms and lakes and the wild animals and birds that depend on healthy lakes for survival.

There is still a great deal to learn with regard to the use of incinerators; the data are still largely incomplete. But we in Ontario have decided to act on the side of caution and have chosen the more prudent route that bans incineration before we create yet another environmental problem.

Finally, I'd like to remind those here today about the Environmental Bill of Rights. As you know, Mr Speaker, the Environmental Bill of Rights, proclaimed this past February, affirms that the people of Ontario have a right to a healthful environment and a responsibility, shared with government, to ensure that the inherent value of the environment is not compromised.

The bill provides Ontarians with the means to act to protect the environment through the creation of an environmental registry, increased public participation in environmental decision-making by government and improved access to the courts, including the right to sue polluters. We are very proud of this important bill of rights; it's part of an effort that must not diminish so that the loon will continue to endure, as it has for the past 200 million years.

I would like to thank Matthew Conroy and all the children who entered the Ministry of Natural Resources contest for reminding us that our obligation to the environment, to all living things and to the future is here

and now. I would like to present this Environmental Bill of Rights poster to Matthew as a token of our gratitude, and I will be asking members to sign it later and to say thank you to Matthew.

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** I am pleased to join the discussion today to speak to an act which would designate an avian emblem for the province that has been brought forward by the member for Sudbury. I certainly support and congratulate the member on the bill she's put forward, putting the common loon in place as the province's official bird. As has already been said, we have an official flower, we have an official tree, we have an official mineral, but there is one emblem that we presently lack, and that is an avian emblem.

The reason I'm speaking today is that I've had an opportunity now for approximately 16 years to listen to the loon each spring, each summer and each fall, and as we return each year to the north to our cottage, it is a sign of hope for us. It's also another sign, because we know that if the loon is gone from our lake, obviously the level of pollution has increased. So we are always rewarded as go back in the spring, and we always feel somewhat better once we hear that plaintive cry of the loon as it resounds across the lake during the night.

During the course of each summer, we're usually rewarded as we see the family of loons gliding across the lake and we see the babies and we see how quickly they can submerge their bodies and appear, it seems like a mile down the lake. They truly are a wonderful bird. They are a bird that seems to have gained the respect and the admiration of people throughout this province, and it certainly is a pleasure for me to be able to support the bill that has been put forward.

I know as well that the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters supports the loon, because it symbolizes for them, as it does for all of us, the Ontario wilderness. Mr Morgan had stated at one time that the loon might well be described as a barometer of environmental health, because there is evidence that breeding success may be lowered on lakes affected by acid precipitation.

Certainly, I am pleased today to have the opportunity to support the bill.

1150

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance):** I am pleased to take part in this debate. My memory, which isn't always the best, does serve me well in this regard, however, going back a number of years to when we thought this bill was going to be debated at an earlier time and events transpired against that happening. Nevertheless, we're here today and I'm very pleased that the debate is taking place to name the common loon as Ontario's official bird. The word "common" I think should be stricken from the description of this bird. Nevertheless, that is what it's called.

Members have referred to the contest back in 1987, when among over 5,000 entries, Matthew Conroy won the contest. It's just a coincidence—I don't think he'd brag about this—but he's my neighbour. I've known the Conroy family for a long time, and if I could be somewhat familiar, I'm pleased that Nels and Carol and

Heather and Matthew are all here, and their Aunt Harriet as well. It really is good to have them here in the assembly this morning.

Matthew was only 10 years old when he won the contest and a student at George Vanier school in Lively, a school with which I have some familiarity as well. So it really is good to have him here.

There is complete agreement, and I very much appreciate the contribution of other members in the assembly this morning on this. People seem to understand that the loon is a symbol of Ontario. There is an appreciation of that and a very warm feeling towards the loon. It's easily recognized by most people in the province. Even if they don't know the difference between an osprey and an owl, they know a loon when they see one.

It really is a great barometer of our lakes and rivers in this province. It is a truly haunting symbol. There's a loon researcher, if you can imagine, by the name of Judith McIntyre and she said this about the loon, "The loon has been called the symbol of wilderness, the positive affirmation of wild places, wild things and wild sounds in the night." That always stayed in my head as a nice description of the loon.

I can remember, if I can be personal once again, being on a canoeing trip on Lake Killarney, at about 8 o'clock one evening in a secluded bay, with the campfire going. Out in the bay were three loons, two adults and a chick. I don't know their habits that well, but it looked to me like they were teaching the little one how to dive. The adults would scurry off to different points once the chick had dived, the chick would come up and look around to see where the adults had gone, and then they would dive down. It was a particularly precious moment. I can tell you that I felt incredibly privileged to be sitting in that secluded bay watching this happen with the two adult loons and the chick. It was truly a beautiful, beautiful moment that has stayed with me to this day.

The popularity of the loon is evident. You can see loons not only on money but on T-shirts and mugs and posters and coasters. They're everywhere. It really is a tribute to this wonderful bird. The public support is evidenced by the Canadian Lakes Loon Survey, which is headquartered in Long Point, I believe, in Ontario. People who want more information can contact them.

In the very limited time I want, as others have done, to congratulate Matthew and his patience over these years for this moment to actually happen. I was starting to have second thoughts myself as to whether I'd have to witness this day from outside the chamber, but I'm really pleased that I'm able to be here and to be part of the debate this morning and I congratulate, particularly, Matthew.

**Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin):** I'm pleased to have the opportunity today to speak in support of Ms Murdock's bill. Being from the north and from Algoma-Manitoulin, particularly from Manitoulin Island and particularly from Mudge Bay, one of the things we look forward to every spring is that moment when northerners cease to walk on water. I know the Treasurer and I believe that we walk on water most of the year, but for about six months of the year we actually do and that's one of the things our southern people can't do.



We look forward to a number of things, and I'm glad the Treasurer is here today, because the first thing we're looking forward to on Manitoulin Island, on Mudge Bay at Kagawong, is the smelt run. I know the Treasurer will want me to bring some smelt to him, or mail him some, as I have in previous years, so that we can celebrate spring. But one of the most important moments, and seriously, one of the most fortunate things in my life and the lives of many of my constituents, and I believe all the people of Ontario, is the return of the loon in the spring.

Having the good fortune to live on Manitoulin Island, the good fortune to live in Kagawong and the good fortune to live in the north, to hear the sound of the loon in the spring, to watch the loons in front of our home, to watch them across lakes, to watch them in other wonderful parts of my riding—Killarney, as the Treasurer has mentioned—is something that strikes more than a small sense of the beauty of nature in the hearts of most of us in this province.

I believe that the contest initiated in 1987, one that I remember the parliamentary assistant at the time, Mr McGuigan, was very interested in, and then the next parliamentary assistant, Mr Ballinger, was tremendously interested in, is finally getting somewhere and that Matthew Conroy will be recognized as the person who has won this.

As the critic for Natural Resources in our party, I am fully cognizant of the importance of the environment, of the ecology and how the loon represents at least in some small part an achievement by the province in better water quality and better environment.

I was once at a conference where someone described water quality. The best way to determine water quality is to determine fish stocks, and certainly fish stocks are what the loon needs to survive. To see, at least in our area, more loons each year is something that I think we can take at least some small pride in in this province.

I don't want to take a long time because I don't have it, but I'm sure I want to congratulate Mr Conroy, Matthew, on his excellent suggestion and his excellent work, and indicate that we also appreciate Ms Murdock bringing this before the House this morning and our full support from this side.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I want to join in supporting this matter before the House today and I want to congratulate Matthew Conroy on being very instrumental, actually, in having this before the House. I well recall sending him a letter of congratulations in a previous incarnation for his work in this regard.

There are seldom areas where we reach a consensus. Even the Treasurer and I today would probably agree on this issue because both of us hail from—at least, I hail from northern Ontario originally and he is now from northern Ontario. I think we recognize the significance of the loon.

My intervention today is to congratulate Matthew once again and to indicate my clear support for this.

**Ms Murdock:** I want to thank all of the members of the House both for their contribution and for their support. It has been 11 years since the Avian Emblem

Act was first introduced. It's been six years since the contest. It's not a parochial issue, as has been made clear today in the debate. It's not exclusive to my Sudbury riding. I think it transcends all of that. It's not controversial; it is agreed upon. I think what is most significant is that it has been chosen by the children of this province.

In 1988, when Matthew received the gift from the Minister of Natural Resources of the day, he was 11 years old and about four feet, 10 inches high. Matthew, I'd like you to stand up there. You can see that he's almost six feet tall and he's now 17 years of age. I would hope that we will have passed this for third reading and made it official before Matthew is an elected person in this House, because that's what it's going to come to. So I'm hoping that everyone will be in support.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The time provided for private members' public business has expired.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

#### LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI CONCERNE L'AIDE SOCIALE

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** We will deal first with ballot item number 45, standing in the name of Mr Carr. If any members are opposed to a vote on this ballot item, will they please rise.

Mr Carr has moved second reading of Bill 144, An Act to amend the Family Benefits Act and the General Welfare Assistance Act. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1203 to 1208.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Mr Carr has moved second reading of Bill 144, An Act to amend the Family Benefits Act and the General Welfare Assistance Act. All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing until your names are called.

#### Ayes

Arnott, Bradley, Brown, Carr, Cunningham, Eves, Harnick, Jackson, Johnson (Don Mills), Jordan, Kwinter, McLean, Miclash, Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound), Poole, Runciman, Sterling, Stockwell, Tilson, Villeneuve.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please rise and remain standing until your names are called.

#### Nays

Akande, Beer, Carter, Charlton, Cooper, Crozier, Duignan, Fawcett, Fletcher, Frankford, Mr Grandmaitre, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), Klopp, Kormos, Laughren, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock (Sudbury), Murphy, O'Connor, O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau), Owens, Rizzo, Sutherland, Waters, White, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Wood.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The ayes are 20; the nays are 40. I declare the motion lost.

## AVIAN EMBLEM ACT, 1994

## LOI DE 1994 SUR L'EMBLÈME AVIEN

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** We will now deal with ballot item number 46, standing in the name of Ms Murdock. If any members are opposed to a vote on this ballot item, will they please rise.

Ms Murdock has moved second reading of Bill 147, An Act to designate an Avian Emblem for Ontario. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Pursuant to standing order 96(k), the bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

**Ms Sharon Murdock (Sudbury):** Mr Speaker, I would ask for unanimous consent from all parties to order it for third reading.

**Interjections:** Agreed.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It's not agreed.

All private matters and private members' business having been debated, I shall leave the chair and the House will resume at 1:30 this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1213 to 1330.*

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

## BLOORVIEW CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** During these tough economic times of fiscal renewal, it is my pleasure to stand in this House and tell the people of Ontario that Bloorview Children's Hospital, in the riding of Oriole, has been granted a three-year accreditation.

Bloorview Children's Hospital is a remarkable place, providing the highest quality of care to many very special children.

I'd like to share with you some of the comments made in that accreditation survey:

"The mission statement states, 'We are committed to providing high-quality interdisciplinary assessment, treatment and continuing care.' This is clearly reflected in the work of the interdisciplinary team and documentation of the care process.

"Board management, physicians and staff of all departments and volunteers are commended for their commitment to patient and family care and to the interdisciplinary team approach.

"On management services:

"The strategic plan is excellent and has received input from external and internal stakeholders. Mechanisms are in place to monitor progress and this is noted with approval.

"Good communication is apparent throughout the organization, as is the positive working relationship among board, management and medical staff.

"The medical staff are commended for their focus on patient care, quality of life, planning for independent living and attention to the family and patient concerns and wishes.

"All staff and volunteers 'live' the mission statement."

This is just a highlight of an excellent survey. I would like to congratulate Bloorview for the outstanding service it provides to those children who need it most.

## TRANSPORTATION FOR THE DISABLED

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I rise to take strong exception to the comments of the member for St George-St David, who yesterday imparted erroneous information about the manufacturing design fault in Orion buses experienced in Toronto and other cities and who has also directed a personal attack on the general manager of the TTC, Mr Al Leach.

As political representatives, we have an obligation to present accurate information, but particularly, in this case, involving such a necessary service for the disabled community.

The member said that Mr Leach "has done nothing and failed to provide adequate alternative modes of transportation." False. The TTC has had parts air-freighted to Toronto; some are expected today. The TTC has increased its taxi fleet and rented every available private vehicle and taxi. Local manufacturers have been contacted and will likely supply equivalent parts.

Al Leach and many concerned and committed TTC staff recognize the seriousness of the problem, are pursuing solutions on several fronts and are targeting for a return to normal service within a week. Even today, every priority is placed on medical and employment trips so that 90% of these requests are satisfied.

This information was readily available, if only the member had contacted the general manager of the TTC. I sincerely hope the member for St George-St David did not have a political motive for his comments. If so, he does his constituents and this chamber a great disservice.

TIINA COTÉ

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** I rise to pay tribute to Tiina Coté, Grimsby's 1994 Citizen of the Year. I had the pleasure of attending a banquet in her honour last night at Place Polonaise in Grimsby, sponsored by the chamber of commerce.

I knew Tiina long before her family moved to Grimsby. We were involved in many of the same activities and groups in the Welland area.

Born and raised in Welland, Tiina went on to earn a bachelor's degree in geography and urban studies from the University of Toronto.

After working in the city of Welland's planning department for a number of years, Tiina chose motherhood and family development as her next career. When she and her husband, Gerry, brought their family to Grimsby, Tiina began a concentrated and continued involvement in the community. Welland's loss is certainly Grimsby's gain.

Tiina is currently superintendent of the Sunday school at Trinity United Church and a member of the senior choir. She volunteers one day a week at her children's school as receptionist and clerk-typist.

As co-chairman of the Grimsby Concerned Citizens' Committee, Tiina has made many presentations before Grimsby and regional boards and the Ontario Municipal Board. The concerned citizens' committee has been quite a force on the political scene in Grimsby. It has sponsored many public forums for candidates in municipal, provincial and federal elections.



Tiina has also shown a strong commitment to the environment. As founder and chairman of the Friends of the Forty, she's worked hard to renew and preserve Grimsby's beautiful Forty Mile Creek. Tiina's enthusiasm for the environment has grown into the annual school children's tree planting project, a program which places thousands of seedlings in parks each year.

But above all, Tiina is a devoted wife, mother, caring friend and neighbour. She is certainly worthy of her new role as Grimsby's 1994 Citizen of the Year. Congratulations, Tiina. Your dedication to the people of Grimsby will be remembered for years to come.

#### POLICE SERVICES

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I rise today to discuss something I think of concern to all members, and that is the unfortunate shooting Tuesday at Just Desserts restaurant. I want first to pass on my condolences, and I'm sure those of all members, to the family and friends of Georgina Leimonis as a result of that unfortunate incident.

I think it's important for us as members also to recognize the fear that these kinds of actions are creating in our communities. We have, I think, a responsibility to respond to that fear and to the concerns about many other incidents that have created fear in our communities. In Metropolitan Toronto, for example, over the last eight or nine years there's been a threefold increase in robberies and an enormous expansion in the violence and use of weapons involved in robberies of businesses. There are home invasions that are causing concerns.

I think we have a responsibility to recognize that one of the things we can do is to enforce and reinforce efforts by police forces to do community policing. I've been working together with Inspector Ed Hegney, the head of 51 Division in my riding, to try and encourage this, but he has told me that because of cutbacks, he has been unable to support the foot patrol. There have been continuing efforts to recognize that that's the best way to police but that we have a responsibility to give support to foot patrols, because we as legislators and the public recognize that's the best way to police our communities.

I would call on the government to do what it can to support foot patrols in our communities.

#### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** Hundreds of my constituents have written to express their concerns about education funding in Ontario.

The current funding formula does not provide equal access to financial resources for both the public and separate education systems. This results in separate school boards spending less on a per capita basis than their public counterparts, and they often run deficits. Prior to 1989, separate boards were forced to rely on provincial grants and residential property taxes because they did not have access to commercial and industrial assessment as a source of revenue.

The former provincial government provided for the sharing of commercial and industrial assessment between public and separate school boards based on the level of residential and farm assessment in the municipality.

The pooling of commercial and industrial assessment was phased in beginning in 1990, but the separate system will not have full access to commercial and industrial assessment until 1995. Separate school supporters are not satisfied with this system because they want the pooled funds distributed on the basis of enrolment, and not residential and farm assessment.

Hundreds of my constituents in Simcoe East want the government to introduce legislation to establish a provincial property tax on commercial and industrial assessment. This revenue would then be distributed equally to all boards. They want this legislation introduced soon to give us appropriate time to study it carefully to ensure it results in equal funding throughout Ontario's education system. I have met with Steve Hinton of the Simcoe County Separate School Board over this very issue.

1340

#### ELECTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** I want to express in this assembly the best wishes of the people of Peterborough for a fair and democratic outcome to the elections which will take place in South Africa on April 27. We hope these elections will prove to be the beginning of an equitable, non-violent, non-racist society for all.

On Tuesday, April 5, a send-off was held at the Peterborough Public Library for Linda Slavin, executive director of the Kwartha World Issues Centre. Linda was one of a group selected by Oxfam Canada to monitor the election.

Linda will fly to Johannesburg tomorrow and will be based in or near Durban. She takes with her many local messages of support for citizens of South Africa, including drawings from children and group messages from churches, school classes and businesses. I am proud of Linda and of the many people in the Peterborough community who have been involved.

Our thoughts and our hearts will be with Linda and the people of South Africa on April 27. Changes will take time, but there is now hope for true multiracial democracy and the benefits which democracy should bring to all. May there be no more violence.

#### NUCLEAR SAFETY

**Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex South):** My statement is with regard to the ongoing health and safety concerns at the Fermi II nuclear plant located in Monroe, Michigan, only 15 kilometres from the southwest border of Essex county and the town of Amherstburg.

On Christmas Day 1993, a fire broke out as a result of a mishap in the plant, causing the plant to be flooded with radioactive water. That water was subsequently discharged into Lake Erie in four separate batches, the most recent occurring only last Thursday.

Although the radioactivity found in the water is within present government standards in both the USA and Canada, there is a concern that the contents can be lethal, even in the smallest doses. In fact, a recent report of the International Joint Commission recommended that in light of recent evidence, governments move towards a policy that will enforce zero discharge of hazardous materials.

Because of these concerns, a local citizens' group,

known as the Essex County Citizens Against Fermi II, held a public meeting a week ago Wednesday in order to increase public pressure on all governments so that action can be taken to prevent future situations that threaten our health and safety.

While it is true that this is an international matter and that our federal government is continuing to monitor the situation, I urge the Minister of Environment and Energy to become involved in this issue by assisting in the process of gathering the necessary authorities together in an attempt to resolve not only the Fermi II situation but also our larger concerns: the broader health, safety, environmental and commercial fishing issues in the region.

#### TVONTARIO TEACHERS' AWARDS

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** This June, TVOntario, in conjunction with the Ontario Teachers' Federation, will be honouring two teachers with the TVOntario teachers' award. The winners will have demonstrated excellence and outstanding achievement in their profession.

These awards bring prestige and recognition to the winners, their schools and their communities. They highlight the innovative and outstanding work that is happening in classrooms around Ontario.

Last year, Yvonne Day of my constituency was honoured for her contribution to elementary education. Kevin Hotten of North Bay was the winner in the secondary school category.

Mrs Day pioneered MICOT, the Media Integrated Classroom of Technology, at St Teresa of Avila School in Elmira. She brought together computers, video cameras, tape recorders, CD players and robots to enhance group work. Students also performed research in language arts, machines and structures, and mathematics.

I am sure that Mrs Day found the experience of developing MICOT and witnessing her students learning from it to be very fulfilling. To be honoured by your peers for your work is a double bonus.

TVOntario and the Ontario Teachers' Federation will be receiving nominations for the 1994 award until April 15. I urge all members of this House to encourage their constituents to consider outstanding candidates in their communities for this award.

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** Volunteers with the Trauma Prevention Council of Hamilton-Wentworth want Highway 6 to lose its reputation as a killer highway. The council has targeted the stretch of road through Flamorough, between Highways 403 and 401, to launch Safe on 6, a community safety program to make Highway 6 a model of driving safety. Program organizer Penelope Hill and a group of volunteers will be working to change drivers' attitudes and behaviour on the road.

Statistics have shown that every year there are about 200 crashes on the highway, many of which result in serious injuries or death. Most of those killed are between the ages of 17 and 40.

Although the Ministry of Transportation is working diligently to improve conditions on Highway 6, Hill and

other volunteers will work to change the attitudes of drivers on the killer highway. Hill claims that the highway can be difficult to manoeuvre but, basically, the accidents have been a result of driver error. Speeding has been the number one cause of fatal accidents on the highway in the past five years. Other factors included disobeying stop signs, driving while intoxicated, following too closely and driving with no strategy to avoid accidents.

Penelope Hill and the other volunteers are to be commended on their efforts to make Highway 6 a model of driving safety.

#### VISITOR

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to join me in welcoming to our chamber this afternoon and seated in the members' gallery west Mr Janko Peric, member of Parliament for Cambridge, Ontario. Welcome.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** I would like to ask for unanimous consent so that I can provide some remarks regarding Holocaust Remembrance Day.

**The Speaker:** Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed.

#### HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** Thank you, Mr Speaker and members of the Legislature, for permitting me to make a few remarks about Holocaust Remembrance Day.

Tonight at sundown, candles will be lit by Jewish families around the world to mark the remembrance of the six million Jews systematically murdered by Nazis during the Second World War.

In the visitors' gallery today, I would like to acknowledge the presence of several extraordinary individuals, individuals who were survivors of the Holocaust, individuals who were partisans during the Holocaust and an individual representing the Righteous Among Nations.

I would like members of the Legislature to welcome, and if they could please stand: Mr Herman Gottesman, Mr Henry Zagdanski, Cantor Louis Danto, Mr Adam Fuerstenberg, Mr Max Guttman, Mrs Eva Kerenyi, Mr Noah Norman Shneidman, Mrs Maria Son, Dr Norbert A. Kerenyi.

I would also like to acknowledge Mrs Joyce Miedema, who received a medal today on behalf of her husband, Pieter, for being among the Righteous Among Nations.

Welcome, honoured guests, to the Ontario Legislature.

I would also like to acknowledge the presence of my very good friend who is also seated in the visitors' gallery, the Consul General of Israel, Mr Dror Zeigerman.

I would also like to acknowledge the presence of Dr Joel Dimitry, national chairman of the Canadian Society for Yad Vashem and the co-chair, Mrs Miriam Gelbloom.

#### 1350

In this year there has been a remarkable occurrence in so far as knowledge being conveyed to people about the Holocaust. I'm sure that most members of this Legislature, if not all, have had the opportunity to see a film by the name of Schindler's List. As a result of this remark-



able film, more people have been given somewhat of an education about the Holocaust than anyone really imagined was possible.

I would like to think that this is the beginning of an educational process that we in Ontario will recognize, and recognize with vigour. I would hope that this educational process will continue as part of the regular curriculum in every school in this province. I would hope that we can do this without any further delay, because the number of survivors of the Holocaust dwindles with every passing year. I think it's incumbent upon us to seek the survivors so that they can tell their story, because it's a real story.

Fifty years ago the liberation began, and through the gates of camps, returning to familiar landscapes, lonely, emaciated survivors went back home. The roads were bombed, the earth was scorched and the skies were covered with smoke. When the survivors reached home, they generally discovered that their last hopes were false and that all other members of their families were dead. Strangers now lived in their homes and the townspeople wished that the survivors had not returned.

With great difficulty and tremendous adversity, many survivors settled in Israel and became a major force in rebuilding a new state. Others came to North America, built new lives and became an inspiration to those who were spared the agonies of the Holocaust. I am one of those who has been so inspired, and I suspect I can speak for everyone in this Legislature and say that they too have been inspired as leaders in the province of Ontario to go back to their communities and ensure that we will never forget.

I'd like to conclude my brief remarks with a quotation from the rabbi of Bluzhou, Rabbi Israel Spira, a Holocaust survivor. In his teachings, he stated, "Every day, every child, after studying the daily lessons prescribed by our sages, should learn about the Holocaust, for it says in our holy Torah, 'Then it shall come to pass, when many evils and troubles are come upon them, that this song shall testify before them as a witness.'" It's from Deuteronomy, verse 31, line 21.

The sufferings and the testimonies when told by Holocaust survivors are a song, a hymn of praise, a testimony to the eternity of the Jewish people and the greatness of their spirit.

**Hon Elaine Ziemba (Minister of Citizenship and Minister Responsible for Human Rights and Race Relations):** On behalf of the government of Ontario and the Premier of Ontario, Bob Rae, I too wish to commemorate this very significant day, Yom Hashoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day.

On this very important and significant day, it is important for all of us to remember the events that took place in Europe during the Second World War. Fifty-one years ago, on April 19, 1943, the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto took a heroic stand. Sick, starving, with no resources, quite debilitated and against all odds, they rose up against the Nazis in a struggle that would last 42 days. For any group to have resisted such a force, and for so long, speaks well of the human spirit. It is even more powerful when one remembers their condition. Many of them, some as young as 11 or 12 years old, joined the

partisans who were fighting the Nazi oppressors.

During the Second World War, over 50 years ago, six million Jews were sent to gas chambers and other forms of death simply because they were Jewish. They became the victims of a regime that hated them, that abused them and that displaced them for no other reason than their heritage.

Those who ignore history are bound to repeat it. In many societies today, we are coming dangerously close to forgetting the history of the Holocaust. There are those who spread hate and deny the Holocaust. The indicators of persistent hatred against a group of people continue to be ever present and are manifested in many ways, including the desecration of places that are held very sacred.

It is important that members of the Legislature and the people of Ontario realize that many of these occurrences are not in some far-distant country. They happen right here in Canada, right here in Ontario.

The League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada reported in its 1993 Audit of Anti-Semitic Incidents that there was a 31% increase of anti-Semitic harassment and vandalism in 1993 over 1992. That is totally unacceptable to all of us and also quite frightening.

Just prior to entering the legislative chamber today, I had the privilege, on behalf of the government of Ontario and the Premier, and along with colleagues on the other side of the House, to be present at a very special reception. The people were already mentioned in the House today by my colleague. These were people who were survivors, the people who worked very hard, against all odds, against the oppressors. They were people who at a very young age, a very tender age, gave their lives in the form of bravery and courage that I don't think any one of us can completely understand.

We also had the privilege of meeting a very remarkable woman. She was given the honour by the consul general of Israel of a very special medal in commemoration of the work that her husband and she did in Holland during the Second World War. They started off by taking in one child, a baby. They then took in that child's brother. They continued to take in other children until they had saved hundreds of lives during the Second World War.

Two years ago, and last year as well, I believe, I read a poem that was written by a very young Jewish girl. She was about 11 or 12 years old. I think she conveys a lot of our sentiments today as we think about and reflect back on what happened during the Warsaw ghetto uprising. I'd like to read it again, because I don't think I could express it any more fully than reading this poem. It was written by Franta Bass and it says:

A little garden,  
Fragrant and full of roses.  
The path is narrow  
And a little boy walks along it.  
A little boy, a sweet boy,  
Like that growing blossom.  
When the blossom comes to bloom,  
The little boy will be no more.

It's hard for any of us to quite comprehend the feelings of that young woman as she wrote that poem, but as we reflect and commemorate this day, let us all pledge, every one of us today in Ontario, that we will all work together for a very peaceful and harmonious society where all of us will be respected and treated with justice and with dignity, and that we'll always remember the words "never again."

**Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights):** Today Yom Hashoah V'Hagvurah, the Holocaust remembrance, is a day that we commemorate each year at this time and it is a day that each year becomes a greater challenge.

The reason for the challenge of course is that as distance separates us from the event, it becomes more and more difficult to deal with those revisionists and those naysayers who claim it never happened.

My colleague from Willowdale has already referred to a remarkable film, *Schindler's List*, which chronicles the creation and destruction of the ghetto in Krakow, what happened to those Jewish citizens, how they were persecuted and murdered, and how through the good faith of one gentleman, a self-proclaimed Nazi who saw the light, some of the people were saved.

It really brings the attention of the whole world to what went on during those days.

1400

To counter that particular event, and I think everyone should see it, is another event that is quite troubling.

Just a couple of weeks ago a poll was released in the United States that showed a significant number of Americans believe that the Holocaust never happened.

There are people who claim that the poll was faulty, but notwithstanding that, there is a group of people in this world, whether they be Neo-Nazis or whether it is just through ignorance, who actually believe that this has not happened.

I say to you, my colleagues in this House, try telling that to the 350,000 survivors of the Holocaust, a number that is diminishing every year because, unfortunately, human nature, human life being what it is, every year there'll be fewer and fewer of them. Try telling that to the 6,000 descendants of the Schindler Juden, those people who survived as a result of Oskar Schindler's deeds. Try telling that to the 10 people sitting in our gallery who are survivors, who are partisans, that it didn't happen. Try telling that to my uncles who were imprisoned in Bergen-Belsen, who saw their relatives killed. Tell them that it was a figment of their imagination.

This, my colleagues, is the challenge we face. It is something that we must be vigilant about, it is something that we must continually keep in the forefront of human information, human knowledge and human education, because, as I say, each year, as we commemorate this particular event, we must always remember so that the world will never forget.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The thoughtful and meaningful comments by the honourable members for Willowdale, for High Park-Swansea and for Wilson-Heights will be provided to the special guests whom the member for Willowdale identified earlier.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question today is for the Solicitor General. I must raise today the issue that is foremost in the minds of people across the city of Toronto, certainly in the city of Ottawa, and indeed I'm sure on the minds of people across the province of Ontario.

But, Mr Speaker, before I place the question, may I tell you that I have searched, in coming into the House today, for a way in which I can raise this issue in a forum which is normally seen to be adversarial and partisan, and I say to the minister that I don't want to raise the issue today as the leader of an opposition party; I want to raise it as a representative of a great many concerned people who are feeling increased fear and alarm because of the acts of random and senseless violence in the killings that took place yesterday in Toronto and earlier in Ottawa.

I guess I want to raise the issue as well as somebody who resides in downtown Toronto and who's feeling the shock that so many others are feeling that this act could have taken place.

Perhaps my first reaction was that of a parent whose daughter lives with me here in the city. I know the reaction of parents will be to feel tremendous anguish for the families of the victims and also to know that it could easily have been the son or the daughter of any one of us.

I raise the issue because I believe we must make sure that as legislators we are doing everything we possibly can to respond to the fears and to the uncertainties that so many people are feeling today. So I would ask you, as Solicitor General for the province of Ontario, if you can tell me what you believe can and must be done and indeed what your government is doing to address the fears and to relieve the tension that is building in this city and in Ottawa and across the province as a result of these incidents.

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** Let me begin my comments with two brief prefaces, one being of course the extension of the condolences of this government, in addition to the members opposite, to the families of those who are affected by these tragedies, and also to say very directly to the honourable member that I appreciate and very much respect the approach she has offered up today on this issue. I would agree with her that this truly is the way we need to approach this as legislators, and I thank her for that gesture and that acknowledgement of that kind of approach.

Let me say that in dealing with the perceptions people have of increasing crime, in addition to the actual increases that are there, it seems to be universally accepted that there is no one, single response that will allow any level of government to deal effectively in one fell swoop with the issue of crime in our communities, whether that be dollars, whether that be officers, whether it be sentencing or incarceration. Any of these things alone, singularly, are not going to resolve the problem. As I say, there's ample evidence that most people believe that; certainly leaders from all three parties at different



levels have expressed that concern.

In wrapping up on the first question, let me say that this issue was a cornerstone of the discussions we had a few weeks ago in Ottawa with other justice ministers from across Canada, led by the Liberal Justice minister. One of the things we focused on was the prevention of crime and the unanimous support of all justice ministers in Canada for a national crime prevention strategy, and to bring effect to that, the development of a national crime prevention council. I certainly think that will provide at least a forum and a vehicle for all of us to work together to deal with the issues that the honourable member has raised.

**Mrs McLeod:** I appreciate both the complexity of the question and the difficulty in response. In respect to the fact that I sincerely raised this question with a view to saying how can we begin to deal with the fears that are there, I will not ask a further supplementary, but just one supplementary, to the minister.

Minister, I think you'll recognize that what adds height to the anxiety people are feeling is the very random nature of the acts that have occurred and the fact that the victims of the killings were simply going about their daily lives. That's really what troubles people most. It's the kind of thing that makes people truly fear for themselves and for their families. It's the kind of thing that shocks us because I think it calls into question the belief that we Canadians have that we live in a country which is safe from that kind of random violence. We don't expect it to happen here and so we're shocked when it does.

But, Minister I believe that we have a responsibility in this Legislature to respond very directly to those fears and concerns and that we need to take some action. We're elected to the House to find solutions. I also believe this is the kind of issue that we need to work together on. I think we have some responsibility here today to determine what kinds of steps we can take to deal with the fact that violent crime is increasing in Ontario and that people indeed are becoming afraid.

I would like to ask whether you would refer this issue, the matter of what steps we can take to address this problem, to the standing committee on justice on an emergency basis so that all three parties can determine what indeed we, as legislators here in the province of Ontario, can do to help people feel safe in their homes and in their neighbourhoods. Will you agree to make the referral so that we can respond to the growing concerns about violent crime in our neighbourhoods?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** I think I heard all the question; there was some heckling towards the end. Unless something changed, I understand the request was to forward it to a standing committee of the Legislature and allow all three parties to review the issue in terms of how we can respond as a collective Legislature of representatives. Obviously, this is the first that I have heard of the suggestion of the honourable member, and in the context and out of respect for the way that she's raised this issue, I would say that I would take the matter under advisement and review the request and get back to her very promptly.

1410

## FIRE SAFETY

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My second question is to the Minister of Housing, again on an issue which causes us sadness and growing concern. The minister will know that yesterday there was another lost life in a basement apartment fire, and it is now the fifth fatality this year.

Minister, you'll also know that we have been calling on your government to take steps to prevent these tragedies by supporting an amendment that would give municipalities the authority to register and to inspect basement apartments that would be legalized under Bill 120. The registration amendment is supported by the coroner's jury review of the New Year's Day basement fire; it's been supported by the Association of Fire Chiefs of Ontario; it's been supported by the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. I believe the amendment could have prevented the kind of tragedy that occurred yesterday.

Minister, will you now support this amendment and ensure that municipalities have the authority to register and then to inspect basement apartments?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** The leader of the official opposition knows that the problem that surrounds apartments in houses and the thing that makes them unsafe is the fact that they exist in an illegal situation where both tenants and property owners do not wish to speak to the people who can give advice and institute the requirements and do the inspections to make sure those apartments are safe.

The only way we're going to have a situation of safety around apartments in houses is if we have a situation in which municipalities can no longer arbitrarily choose the zones in which apartments in houses cannot exist or can exist. That is the key to safety as far as apartments in houses are concerned, and I hope the leader of the official opposition recognizes that.

**Mrs McLeod:** Minister, I know I've raised this issue with you before, and I'll continue to raise the issue, because what I do know is that legalizing basement apartments will do nothing to make existing basement apartments safe.

There is nothing in the legislation to make existing basement apartments legal that requires that any of the regulations can be met, can be enforced, that any inspections can take place, because there is nothing that is going to tell inspectors where the basement apartments are. That's the problem. Allowing for the registration, requiring the registration, of basement apartments would allow the municipalities to identify where the apartments exist, and then they could give the inspectors very clear authority to ensure that the safety standards are met. That's the issue we keep asking you to address.

Minister, you're not the one who has to go and inspect and ensure the safety of the apartments. You're not the one who has to go and fight the fires. You're not the one who was sitting on the coroner's jury investigating the tragedies that have already occurred. I ask you again today, why do you refuse to take the advice of the

experts who live and work with this problem daily and who have said to you, "This is what is needed to prevent these tragedies in the future"?"

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I want the Leader of the Opposition to understand, if she does not now, that the passage of Bill 120 does not legalize apartments which do not meet standards, which do not meet health standards or safety standards or fire code standards.

When she says that the passage of the bill will not make them safe, of course she is right. No one has ever suggested, in the simpleminded way that she does, that we have claimed there will be a waving of the wand and apartments which are now unsafe will become safe. This is not the case, not the case at all. What Bill 120 provides is that they shall become legal, and that in order for a person who owns a house to have a legal apartment in a house, that person must seek a planning approval, a building permit. Does that provide a registration at the city? Does it provide the information to the owner about how to make the apartment safe?

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Who are they?

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for Etobicoke West is out of order.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Does it require that an inspection take place? This is the process that makes sense. If the Leader of the Opposition believes that passing a piece of legislation in this House—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** —that says that everybody who now operates an apartment in a house shall register it is going to stop fires in apartments in houses, I think she's being very, very simpleminded.

**Mrs McLeod:** I don't understand how the minister can continue to give me exactly the same response every time I try and make it clear that the issue we're dealing with is not the issue of new basement apartments for which one might get a building permit and then be able to register them. And for the moment I won't deal with the issue of whether or not basement apartments would be added long after the new house is built, without any building permit at all.

The issue I want to focus on is the reason why I understood you were bringing in Bill 120 in the first place, and that was the fact that there are 100,000 illegal basement apartments right now; more, the minister says. The concern is, how are those 100,000 or more illegal basement apartments going to ever become safe places for people to live? Because if you make them legal, you must take some steps to make sure they are also safe.

Minister, right now, the only way you can ensure that safety regulations or fire regulations are being met is if there is a complaint and if there is then a search warrant obtained. That is not an efficient process. You yourself have said that a form of registration will work for new basement apartments in new homes. That's why you keep telling me about the building permit approach.

**The Speaker:** Could the leader place a question, please.

**Mrs McLeod:** It's a way of registering new apartments in new houses. I suggest to you that the same registration process could be at least as effective and efficient in dealing with the currently existing basement apartments, which are the source of our concern.

Minister, you have shocked me today by saying that you agree that making these apartments legal does nothing to make them safe. I ask you, then, as minister: What will you do, as you move to make these apartments legal, to ensure that they will indeed be safe?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I did not say and I would not say that making them legal has nothing to do with making them safe. It has everything to do with making them safe. If the member opposite is concerned about existing apartments, let her say so, and let me ask her how she believes that the creation of a registry or a law requiring registration is going to automatically make things safe. It doesn't.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** The member for Halton Centre is out of order.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** In fact, she complains that the method of assuring safety in an apartment which is now legal as far as zoning is concerned—people won't call in, complain, or ask questions or ask advice or ask for assistance when they are illegal as a result of zoning. If we change that situation, we open up the door to provide for them becoming legal according to the health and safety standards that we want to see applied in this province. There is no other way. A registry doesn't magically make them safe either. The Leader of the Opposition has to know that's the case and quit playing games on this issue.

#### HIV IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have a question for the Minister of Correctional Services. Earlier today, a member of my staff spoke with Superintendent Balmain of the London Police Force. Superintendent Balmain confirmed that several months ago, as a result of the London pornography investigation and charges against a young offender, the London police received information that a young offender was an HIV carrier.

The London police then contacted the local board of health, and the board of health contacted a young offenders' facility, Camp Dufferin, where this individual had been a resident. The camp officials then compiled a list of 80 other young offenders who may have been in contact with this individual. Several days ago, the province's chief medical officer of health was asked to take charge of efforts to locate these 80 young people and encourage them to be tested for HIV.

1420

Minister, can you indicate the time line between when Camp Dufferin was informed by the board of health and when Dr Schabas was asked to get involved, and can you indicate why this serious matter has been hidden from public view?

**Hon David Christopherson (Minister of Correctional Services):** I do not have the exact dates in front of



me, but to the best that I can release information under current legislation, I'll be quite willing to provide the honourable member with that information before the end of business today.

Let me say with regard to the appropriateness of action taken that I am certainly aware of this issue, I'm aware of the circumstances, and I am not aware at all of anything that should suggest to someone that there has been inappropriate action taken or not taken on the part of ministry officials.

**Mr Runciman:** As frequently is the case, I beg to differ with the minister.

This individual, we're told, was involved in tattooing efforts within the institution. That's the reason why, apparently, he came in contact with as many as 80 other young offenders who were incarcerated in Camp Dufferin. We're advised that the facility put the names together of the 80 individuals, but they have very few addresses. So what in fact is happening is that the government has turned Dr Schabas, the chief medical officer of health in the province, into a detective. Who knows how long it will take him to track down these young people and who knows how many other innocent people may be put at risk?

Minister, again I ask for a clearer explanation as to why this matter has been kept hushed up. Why have you not gone public with this? This is a serious public health matter. I'm asking you, why are you dealing with it in the way in which you're dealing with it?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** There are not a lot of specifics in the question the honourable member asks. I say again to him that the responsibility for the control of communicable diseases is that of the provincial medical officer of health. The issue was appropriately turned over to the doctor, as is prescribed by legislation and procedures of the province. I am still not aware, inherent in any of the questions, of any factual basis for suggestions that something untoward has happened with regard to the administration of this issue.

**Mr Runciman:** I think that what the minister has done and his ministry has done in fact is unconscionable. We're talking about perhaps a very serious public safety, public health risk that is posed by 80 people out there. Your chief medical officer of health is unsure how to get in touch with these people. He was only contacted a few days ago. We haven't yet confirmed when Camp Dufferin was contacted about this, but we know the individual was charged some months ago.

Mr Minister, what I'm saying is, why have you not gone public in the sense of putting out dates of people who were resident in that camp during that period of time and asking them to call a 1-800 number? They may be at risk. They may be putting other innocent people at risk. That's why I'm asking you, why have you not acted? Why have you not gone through the media? Why have you not had some kind of public effort?

I suggest perhaps that it's because of the fact that you were advised and urged by Dr Schabas himself back in 1990 to have AIDS designated as a virulent disease under the Health Protection and Promotion Act. You failed to

act. I asked you the question nine months ago in this House, "Are you prepared to support reclassification of HIV from section 22 to 35 so that Correctional Services may test inmates for HIV and reduce the problem of multiple carriers and protect guards and inmates alike?"

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Runciman:** Now we have a very serious problem on our hands. You were asked nine months ago. Your government was asked over three and a half years ago to act by the person you've asked to investigate this situation now. I think you have been extremely negligent and put the public at risk. Are you now prepared to act on Dr Schabas's recommendation made to your government three and a half years ago?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** I don't believe for a moment that the honourable member, again, has made a case. I don't understand clearly where he's making a linkage between the reclassification issue and what has happened in this instance. They're separate issues and I don't know that they necessarily link in this particular case, other than to perhaps make for a question in the House.

With regard to why we didn't publicize it and run headlines, the honourable member knows very well that there is legislation in this province that assures people certain fundamental medical rights. Where doctors in positions of responsibility, like the Ontario medical officer of health, believe that action like that should be taken, there are measures that they can approach to take the necessary procedures. But to suggest here that automatically there should have been publicly released a list of everybody's name who may or may not have possibly been exposed to some kind of danger is a nonsensical type of proposition, I would suggest.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** My question is to the Minister of Health. If an expectant mother arrives at a delivery room in Ontario today, what is the likelihood of her being denied a pain-relieving epidural?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** Very unlikely.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** According to an article in the Wall Street Journal, a woman in labour who arrived at St Michael's Hospital in Toronto was denied an epidural because there was only one anaesthetist on duty for the entire hospital. Her situation is not unique. Thousands of women in Ontario are giving birth in severe pain. This is not what our compassionate health care system is supposed to be all about.

This isn't a question of more money. We realize the financial constraints you've placed on the system. You've capped the OHIP fee-for-service pool at \$3.8 billion. But in addition, you unilaterally, without the OMA, reduced the number of training positions for anaesthetists and general surgeons who can administer epidurals. So I ask you, why did you do this when you know there's a shortage of doctors who can administer this treatment?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I'm aware of the article in the Wall Street Journal to which the member refers. I read it with

interest, amazement and incredulity. The article is an attack on the efforts this province has made to provide choices for women, to provide midwives, to provide birthing centres, and quite frankly I don't think that for the member to use that as a basis for questioning the excellence and the capacity of all of our hospitals to provide women with the care they need during childbirth is at all justified.

*Applause.*

**Mr Jim Wilson:** That's a very interesting response and one that shouldn't be applauded by your colleagues, because I don't think you checked out the facts behind the article in the Wall Street Journal. Women in Thunder Bay are out of luck during delivery and, according to a spokesperson for the Ontario Medical Association, the availability of epidurals is sporadic in most small hospitals. The situation is serious for many women.

Commenting on our health care system in the Wall Street Journal, which is significant because it is read worldwide, the Wall Street Journal said: "The system can no longer cope with an event as straightforward as birth. It is as if medical practice in Canada is reeling backward in time."

Minister, you talk about choice. Why then are you denying women the choice to have an epidural to assist them during the birth of their children?

**Hon Ruth Grier:** It's been a long time, but I've certainly had experience of the birthing situation in this province. So have my daughters-in-law. So have many people who have had the best possible experiences, who have had the care they need, who have had the care they require and who have had the choices they wished to make with respect to birthing respected.

For the member to say that the Wall Street Journal, in its attack on our health care system, justifies him to attack the hospitals, the doctors, the nurses and the practitioners in the province, who are second to none, is, as I say, beneath him as a critic of the Health department.

1430

#### NON-PROFIT HOUSING

**Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence):** I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Minister, in a letter dated January 28, 1994, which went out along with some 2,000 copies of a non-profit housing association publication to non-profit housing organizations, municipalities and others, you directly challenge the integrity, independence and objectivity of the Provincial Auditor.

In sending this letter on your letterhead with your signature, you endorse the position of the document as put out by the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association, which discredits and makes partisan the 1992 report of the Provincial Auditor. The document clearly states that the auditor misrepresented fundamental facts about non-profit housing and that he attempted to mislead the public.

Minister, I ask you: Do you think it's acceptable to attack the integrity of the Provincial Auditor in this way? Do you find that acceptable behaviour?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** The material that was sent out to which the member refers

was material that was provided to many partners in housing around the province, many interested municipal councillors and media outlets, and it was intended to provide all those people and groups with a spectrum of information about the non-profit housing program.

As the member is aware, there has been a ferocious and well-organized and well-paid-for campaign by the organization of landlords in this province, so we wished to make sure that people who had received the information sent out by the Fair Rental Policy Organization also received some other views on the non-profit housing program in the province.

The ONPHA material that was included in that package represents one point of view of what the Provincial Auditor had to say in his report. It's in no way endorsed by me, and I will be quite happy to have information mailed to the people who received that information that indicates that this was the point of view of the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association.

**Mr Cordiano:** Let me quote what the letter that went out with the document said on January 28, 1994—

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** Who is this from?

**Mr Cordiano:** This is from the Minister of Housing, of course. There was a letter that was attached to the document.

"Unfortunately, during this heated debate, a lot of the facts about non-profit housing have been distorted." That's a direct quote from the minister, the letter that went out with the document, the information package that was sent out to set the record straight. This is what the minister said.

Minister, you suggest very clearly that the efforts of the auditor were to distort the facts. In fact, the document which you endorsed, because you put out your letter with your signature attached to it, the document—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mr Cordiano:** I remind you clearly what the document stated. It said that the auditor had four misleading facts, they were misleading, that in fact debate that was ensuing was becoming highly partisan and that the auditor was engaged in this highly partisan debate through use of his report.

**The Speaker:** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Cordiano:** It's clearly inappropriate, Minister, to attack the auditor in this way, even if you suggest it's an indirect fashion. Minister, are you saying that you would disagree even with—if I may have another moment, Mr Speaker; this is important.

**The Speaker:** Quickly, please.

**Mr Cordiano:** Your deputy this morning, before committee, Madam Minister, said that he clearly dissociates himself with the comments that were made in that document.

**The Speaker:** Would the member please place a question.

**Mr Cordiano:** He clearly thinks it's inappropriate for



the way in which this thing unfolded. He distanced himself from this, and clearly, Minister, you should know—

**The Speaker:** The member has had a considerable amount of time. Would the member please take his seat.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** Would the member please take his seat. The member is out of order.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Mr Speaker, first of all, the member has to acknowledge that in all the statements that have been made by the Ministry of Housing representatives and by myself in discussion of the auditor's report, we have never taken issue with the validity of the auditor's report.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Your letter led people to believe that.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** We have taken issue with some of the conclusions—

**Mr Callahan:** The letter speaks for itself.

**Mr Elston:** The letter was written; it said just that.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** —but we have never taken issue with the validity.

The member is indeed correct in saying that the Deputy Minister of Housing, in committee this morning, made it quite clear that it was not the view of the ministry nor of this minister that the misleading headline was appropriate on this occasion. It is for that purpose that I will be mailing additional information—

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** You said in your letter you are setting the record straight.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** It is your own letterhead.

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** This is two years in a row you said the same thing about the auditor.

**The Speaker:** Would the minister take her seat, please.

**Mr Stockwell:** What did you mean when you said "set the record straight"?

**The Speaker:** The member for Etobicoke West is out of order. Would the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I'd be glad to conclude and indicate once again to the member that the ministry will be providing additional information on the non-profit housing program, in particular a ministry analysis of the report done by Clayton consultants for the Fair Rental Policy Organization, the landlords' organization. Included in that mailing I will have a statement—

**Mr Tilson:** To set the record straight. Same old stuff.

**Mrs Marland:** Same consultants?

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** —saying that it was not our intent to endorse the statement in the headline of the Ontario non-profit association material which was mailed in the earlier mailing.

#### TVONTARIO HEADQUARTERS

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** In the absence of the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

It has come to my attention, and our staff confirmed this morning, that TVOntario is looking for new office space. TVOntario has narrowed its potential sites to three and intends to finalize the deal in the near future.

The Minister of Finance is responsible for protecting the public purse of this province. Will the minister tell the House if he is aware that Ontario's publicly funded television network is looking for a new office building and who would have approved this proposed move?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I thank the member for Wellington for the question. That's why I came to question period today.

I should tell the member for Wellington that I was aware that there was a problem with existing accommodation, but that really is the extent of my knowledge at this point.

**Mr Arnott:** I came to question period to hear an answer, and that wasn't an answer.

TVOntario currently leases space uptown at Yonge and Eglinton, as most members know, and according to staff at the network, they would like to consolidate and update their current conditions. Given TVOntario's track record for excessive spending, and the very expensive experience of your Workers' Compensation Board building, we have reason to be very concerned about these plans. Will the minister personally guarantee this House that any move by TVOntario will be a better deal for Ontario's taxpayers than they're receiving today, and not another financial debacle like the new Workers' Compensation Board building?

**Hon Mr Laughren:** Yes, Mr Speaker, I will give the member that assurance. Also, though, as well as it being an appropriate move financially, it will also be a move that allows TVOntario to continue to deliver a very valuable service in as efficient and effective a way as possible.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The Minister of Housing has a response to a question asked earlier by the honourable member for Mississauga South.

1440

#### NON-PROFIT HOUSING

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** Two days ago the member raised some questions surrounding an internal memo of the non-profit corporation Cityhome here in the city of Toronto. In response to her allegations during the question that we had to approve, in the Ministry of Housing, cost overruns and other irregularities, that we were turning a blind eye to problems and there was gross mismanagement, I undertook to provide an explanation.

Cityhome has contracted for four non-profit groups, including itself, in the construction of a \$42-million development at the location, George-Jarvis. It is correct, as it was identified in this memo and mentioned by the member opposite, that costs in this project have exceeded the estimates.

We know of costs which have exceeded estimates which the Ministry of Housing believes to be justified. Those are imposts and levies, an additional \$18,000; taxes during construction, an additional \$23,891; under review are fees for architects and consultants, legal fees and construction costs which, according to the memo from Cityhome or in Cityhome, are estimated to be about 2% above estimates.

The total project is still at 100% of maximum unit price for 1991.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Thank you.

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** The memo said that the unit prices were 16% above the maximum, so I guess what the minister is saying is that the memo was wrong. I find it interesting, when my question was based on the fact that we're looking, according to the memo, at \$1-million to \$1.5-million overrun and the minister stands up and talks about \$30,000. It would be laughable if it wasn't so sad.

Imposts and levies of \$30,000: Where does that fit in with a project that's \$1 million or \$1.5 million over? How is it that your ministry would approve this project with construction costs over the budget at a time when everybody knows construction costs have been down?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** The member did not hear my first response, obviously. What I said to the member was that the construction costs, which are over the original estimate, have not been approved. The ministry has not approved them. I didn't mention a figure of \$30,000. I indicated that we would approve imposts and levy increases of \$18,000 and extra tax costs during construction of \$23,891. I will repeat to the member that the project, from the Ministry of Housing's point of view, has been approved at 100% of maximum unit prices for 1991 and not above that. Got it?

#### PENSION FUNDS

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** My question is to the Minister of Finance. It has to do with the issue of pensions and what the government's plans are for pensions.

As I think the House knows, there are enormous unfunded liabilities, debts, in the teachers' pension and the public service pension. The government, as we all know, decided to take a three-and-a-half-year holiday from making any payments against the unfunded liability in the teachers' pension.

I might say that the debt is developing in there and growing every year by roughly \$500 million. A three-and-a-half-year holiday doesn't stop the debt from growing. The only way, as the minister knows, that legally the government was allowed to do that was by passing legislation.

My question is this: I gather that you are looking at a similar holiday from the Ontario public service pension plan. The Ontario public service pension plan has also a very large unfunded liability, a debt in there of I think almost \$3 billion.

My question is this: If you are looking at taking a

holiday and not making the required payments, can you tell the House, will this require legislation? If it requires legislation, when will the Legislature see that legislation so we can understand what you're doing with that very large unfunded liability in the public service pension?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** Mr Speaker, can I please refer that question to the Chair of Management Board?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** The essential part, I would gather, of the member's question is, would such a change require legislation? Yes, it would. When will we see the legislation? I seriously can't predict that at this point. I don't know if there will be any.

**Mr Phillips:** The reason I raise this is because we've now seen that in the last few days Hydro has dealt with its contractual difficulties. One way they've dealt with it is by cutting payments to the pension, I gather. We found the government just at Christmastime took a holiday and actually withdrew money from the teachers' pension.

I might add, and the member will know this, when Bob Rae was in opposition, I think he called that legalized theft. I've got the document here; he called it legalized theft. That was the language that was used.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** Who said that?

**Mr Phillips:** Premier Rae said that when he was in opposition.

My question is this: We've now seen the government running up debt of roughly \$1.2 billion extra in the teachers' pension, we see Hydro has made a decision to fund its contract through reduced pension payments and we now understand, although it's behind closed doors, that the government is planning to do a similar thing with the public service pension.

If you will not tell us when you're bringing in the legislation, will you at least undertake to give the House now a listing of the decisions you've made on the various public sector pensions, what sort of reduction you've made in your contribution to them to date, what sort of reduction you're planning next fiscal year and, more importantly, what the implications are for the taxpayers now as you run the debt up on these unfunded liabilities?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** There are again two essential components that I hear in the member's question. Firstly, the member talks about "behind closed doors." We are negotiating around pension matters as a result of legislative changes that were made publicly here in this Legislature, prior to Christmas, under the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, which made pensions a negotiable item in this province for the civil servants who worked for this government. We are negotiating with them under that legislation around pension matters.

1450

I cannot predict what the outcome of those negotiations might be and therefore I can't predict precisely when or if there will be any legislation in this Legislature as a consequence of those negotiations. But lastly, any initiatives that this government has already taken around public sector pensions are already public knowledge and part of the public record.



## COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** I have a question for the Minister of Education and Training. I have a copy of the memo that was sent to college board chairs on March 30 from the chair of the Council of Regents, and I'm pretty sure that you'll know about this memo. In it I am going to quote from the chair. He says this: "Your fiduciary responsibility"—this is to the board chair—"is not to the local community but to the provincial government for post-secondary funds and for other provincial support."

Mr Minister, you and I both know that there is a problem out there right now, and the timing of this memo, I see no need for it at all. Why would the chair be underlining this responsibility that he feels is to the province of Ontario?

I thought that Helen Friedman, who is the chair of Conestoga community college, asked a good question when she said, "Why don't we call these provincial colleges?"

Our great hope and expectation is that the community is represented diversely on these boards, and we count on them for their support. Whom do you think the community college boards should be responsible to?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** It's very clear that legally, community colleges are responsible to the provincial government, which is responsible to the public. With the kinds of dollars we're talking about, that would only be what you would expect. That's where the public accountability has to lie. We grant the money to colleges and somebody has to be responsible to the voters and the taxpayers of this province. Legally, that of course is the provincial government. I think you understand that.

**Mrs Cunningham:** I think that in the past, if that question had been asked of any former minister, they would have at least said that the community college boards are responsible both to their communities and to the province of Ontario. I really underline that as being extremely important, because we count on today's citizens as volunteers to serve on these boards and to give the best advice they can for a vision and for long-term planning for our community colleges. It's so important that we get communities feeling that they can contribute, giving the best advice they can to the minister. I think he should talk to the chair of the colleges.

I'm telling you right now, Mr Speaker, that the College of Regents is being accused of establishing some kind of an empire. In looking at the most recent estimates, I have to tell you that I think they are going to be rightfully accused of establishing an empire, not only in governance but in the way they spend money.

The estimates in 1992-93 said that the Council of Regents received approximately \$1.4 million.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mrs Cunningham:** I will, Mr Speaker. One more sentence and then the question.

Approximately \$1.4 million was the estimate for 1992-93. In 1993-94, the Council of Regents received approxi-

mately \$3.1 million. This is an increase of 150%. Can you tell us what other agency or board got any kind of an increase even close to that? Do you think also that they should rightfully be accused of creating this empire, not only in governance but in the amount of money, a 150% increase?

**The Speaker:** Could the member complete her question, please.

**Mrs Cunningham:** That's it.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** The member knows from the estimates that the Council of Regents was asked to take on a major new responsibility, the college standards and accreditation system, which is all part of the accountability framework. The critic for the third party and the critic for the official opposition have both said that the post-secondary system needs to be more publicly accountable, that we need to have standards that are applied. This initiative was actually applauded by the opposition parties.

You can't have an initiative on standards and accreditation of courses across the system and then underfund it, because I know exactly what would happen. The next question would be, the member would get up if we hadn't funded it and say that the initiative was a farce, that it wasn't funded and that it was just a big showcase with nothing to back it up. That is typical of the opposition. They want to have it both ways all the time, every day of the week.

## FARMPLUS PROGRAM

**Ms Christel Haeck (St Catharines-Brock):** My question is to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. In January, several colleagues of mine, the members for Lincoln, Niagara South and myself, were able to join the Minister of Agriculture in St Catharines to launch a new program called FarmPlus. It's obviously part of the larger program, the agriculture investment strategy.

In the meantime, I've received several calls from constituents who are farmers, who are very much interested in finding out how to access the program and a whole range of other questions. Local officials are obviously quite pleased with the performance. I want the minister to give me, and obviously my farm constituents, a better idea on how the program is doing. I think all of the people in this place really need to find out how successful this particular program is.

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** The member is quite correct. This is a program which is a component of the agriculture investment strategy that has been very well received in rural Ontario.

In terms of an update, at this point in time, \$11 million in sales in the GICs has been achieved, which is incredible, because in the first four and a half weeks there were \$10 million in sales and we had expected to sell \$50 million over the period of three or four years. So we've done very well. There's still room for growth in the program.

In terms of the lending part of this program, because the intent of this program is to recycle money into rural

communities back into the agriculture and food sector, to this point in time, \$700,000 has been lent back in rural Ontario to provide capital for new initiatives in rural Ontario.

**Ms Haeck:** Locally, and I think this is important for some of the members from Toronto to hear, and I know Mr Bradley raised a question earlier this week regarding the viability of agriculture in the peninsula, the St Catharines Standard, a paper we read with some care, I know the member for St Catharines will agree with me, says that the success of the FarmPlus program locally is to the tune of about \$5 million. I would like the minister to again tell us, for the benefit of all the agricultural members, those from rural Ontario, what options do investors now have under FarmPlus, and really what does this mean to the farmers? How do they stand to benefit by what I consider to be this very valuable program?

**Hon Mr Buchanan:** The member raises a good point, because the St Catharines paper carried a story which said the Niagara Credit Union has reached its limit. We allocated a certain upper ceiling for all the credit unions that are participating and they had reached their limit, which I believe was around \$5 million; at any rate, they had reached their limit, and the story came out.

I want to assure the member and the farmers and the investors from the Niagara area that my staff has visited with the credit union and we've reassured them that they can go beyond that limit if they choose to do so.

They have chosen to concentrate on lending out the money they have taken in in sales rather than try to sell more GICs. So they will be concentrating voluntarily on lending out what they've taken rather than add on to sales.

I would add that this program is available in selected areas across the province. It's not available at all credit unions, and I would encourage all members, especially in the central part of Ontario, to talk to their local credit unions and see if they can get them interested in this program. It will benefit farmers and investors in other parts of the province. But the people from Niagara can participate in this program and it has been very successful.

#### ARTS AND CULTURAL FUNDING

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship which concerns the white-authors-need-not-attend writers' conference that her government is sponsoring through a grant provided by the Ontario Arts Council.

Mr Speaker, I want to tell you that I don't quarrel with the idea of a conference to celebrate native authors or so-called authors of colour. But I do have a problem with a publicly financed and publicly sponsored conference that bars and excludes people on the basis of the colour of their skin.

I don't want the minister to hide behind the autonomy of the Ontario Arts Council, which is providing a grant of some \$15,000. I want to know the opinion of the Minister of Citizenship. I want to know whether she supports the notion that the government and taxpayers should sponsor conferences that exclude people on the

basis of the colour of their skin. I want to know the minister's opinion.

**Hon Elaine Ziemba (Minister of Citizenship and Minister Responsible for Human Rights and Race Relations):** I thank the member opposite for raising this particular concern and this particular question. As the member opposite very rightfully said, this comes under—

**Mr Sorbara:** I want to know your opinion.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** And you will get it. Just for the audience so they will know, the member opposite was getting a little agitated that I wasn't giving my personal opinion. I will give you my personal opinion, but first I would just like to state that this does come under the Ministry of Culture, and because I'm not the Minister of Culture, I'm just a little bit at a loss about how the funding arrangements were arranged. I have not seen the grant. I don't know how it was done. I have nothing to really set my mind about the preamble or how it was based and how they were allocated their funding.

1500

On a personal basis, though, now to talk to you about personal opinions, the Ontario Human Rights Commission, which comes under our ministry, states very clearly that when there are groups of people who have been disadvantaged—this is under section 14 of the Human Rights Code that was passed in 1982 by, I guess, the Conservative Party at the time—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** Yes. It says very clearly that when there are groups of people who have been disadvantaged and have not had an opportunity to be treated fairly and equitably and given an equal opportunity to participate, there can be special measures made to accommodate those individuals.

As I said previously—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister please conclude her response.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** —this would appear to me that this is, on the surface, what the member opposite is raising, that perhaps this group has decided to hold a conference for people so they can catch up and be brought up to speed along with the rest of the population. But not having had the opportunity to read the grant, I would not know.

**Mr Sorbara:** I take it from the minister's response that the minister's opinion is that this is a good thing, that it is appropriate for a government to sponsor a meeting that excludes certain people not on the basis of talent or area of expertise but solely on the basis of the colour of their skin.

I want to suggest to you, Mr Speaker, that it's a little bit ironic, not to say hypocritical, that three months ago we had the Premier of the province visiting various studios around the province singing his little ditty, "We're In The Same Boat Now, where the truth is that what the government sponsors are specific boats where some people are excluded.



I want to ask her why a writer like Nino Ricci, an Italian-Canadian writer, who wrote a pretty good book called *The Lives of the Saints*—it was so good it won the Governor General's Award—why is it that your government would sponsor a conference which would prohibit the participation of a writer of Italian-Canadian origin like Nino Ricci? Why is Nino Ricci excluded from this conference that you're helping to sponsor and pay for?

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** Again, I think that we must remind the member opposite not only of my only personal viewpoints but of the viewpoints of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which is a very important piece of legislation, of the Ontario Human Rights Code, which again is a code that goes over all the legislation in Ontario, and of the Canadian Human Rights Code, which is the prevailing code of Canada when it comes to all sorts of jurisdictions, which state very clearly that when there are groups of people who have not had an opportunity to be able to participate fully in our society, we will be able to give special treatment so that they can be brought up to speed and be given those equal opportunities.

**Mr Sorbara:** Sixty years ago politicians used to justify "no Jews allowed on the beach," the same sort of thing.

**The Speaker:** Would the member for York Centre please come to order.

**Hon Ms Ziemba:** I think we will also say that there are groups and organizations that hold special conferences for special groups of people at all times and as long as it falls under the prevail of the Human Rights Code and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, I think all of us would have to say that is the law of the land and that's what we should be able to consider.

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to join me in welcoming to our chamber, seated in the Speaker's gallery, a very special group of visitors who are from the Legislative Assembly of the province of Sindh, Karachi, Pakistan: the Honourable Ghaus Bux Khan Mahar, the Speaker, Mr Syed Qaim Ali Shah, member of Parliament, Mr Zakir Hussain Mirza, who is the secretary to the provincial assembly, and Mr Shahyar Mahar. Accompanying the delegation is Mrs Freda Shah, the consul general of Pakistan in Toronto. Please welcome our special guests.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** Mr Speaker, I want to rise on a point of order with respect to rules 32(a) and (b) and 21(a) and (b) under the standing orders of the House.

Today, as you know, as every other day in the House, 20 minutes were allotted for ministerial statements. There were no statements on this occasion, nor were there any ministerial statements yesterday. The Minister of Health will be making a statement tomorrow outside of the House with respect to a cancer strategy that affects one out of three people in Ontario. That announcement will be made in a closed session of the Canadian Cancer Society, to which members only are invited.

You will recall, Mr Speaker, that as part of our

legislative function, my party originated and carried out a task force on cancer care in the autumn and brought those issues, in what I believe was a non-partisan way and a respectful way, to the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health, it seems to me, owes every person in Ontario and the people in this House the privilege of hearing her response to those issues—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. The member will know that, first, she does not have a point of order. At the same time the member will also know, as do all members, that all the Speaker can do is encourage ministers of the crown to make statements in the House rather than outside the House, but there is nothing in the standing orders to compel ministers to follow that advice.

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It seems to me that the purpose of this Legislature, and the historic purpose of this Legislature, is to raise matters of urgent importance to the people of this province. Cancer is an issue that is important to every person in this province and—

**The Speaker:** And what is your point of order?

**Mr Jim Wilson:** Mr Speaker, my point of order is, do you not have any authority whatsoever to compel this minister to do the right thing and to be courteous to the people of this province—

**The Speaker:** Would the member please take his seat.

#### PETITIONS VIOLENCE

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I am very pleased to read today a petition which was submitted by St Joseph Catholic women's league in Sault Ste Marie, containing 18 petitions and 199 names:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;

"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to emulate or admire, but rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

I join, with my signature, the other 1,678 people who have signed these petitions in this past week.

#### COLLINGWOOD GENERAL AND MARINE HOSPITAL

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that reads as follows:

"Whereas continued government funding cutbacks will force the Collingwood General and Marine Hospital to close eight more hospital beds and these cutbacks are having a continued, negative impact on employment in the Collingwood area;

"Whereas the government is failing to adhere to their own 'principles of restructuring,' which states that restructuring of the hospital sector must be linked to equitable funding, appropriate and accessible community-based health services, and that restructuring initiatives must address the impact of these changes on hospital staff, the local economy and the health care needs of the community;

"Whereas the government refuses to give the green light to redevelop the General and Marine Hospital even though the provincial government announced funding for the project in 1987, and even though the General and Marine cannot achieve additional operating efficiencies unless the hospital is redeveloped;

"Therefore, we demand that the provincial government immediately approve the redevelopment of the General and Marine Hospital and that the hospital be given some financial breathing space to assess the impact of these bed closures on the labour and health care needs of the Collingwood community."

I've signed this petition. I obviously agree with this petition and I want all members to know that these few pages are part of a petition that has been signed by 6,919 people from the Collingwood area in my riding of Simcoe West. I want to thank the Collingwood labour council, and Mr Murray Dupe in particular for going door to door and doing the legwork on this petition. It's extremely important and we eagerly await the government's response.

1510

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows," and may the Conservatives listen:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

This is vital to the people in Wilmot Creek in my community and I've signed this.

#### ADOPTION

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** I have a petition to the Honourable Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas the Adoption Reform Coalition of Ontario brings together various organizations to recommend reform of Ontario adoption law based on honesty, openness and integrity;

"Whereas ARCO, the Adoption Reform Coalition of Ontario, believes that existing adoption secrecy legislation, although originally based on research done with good intentions, is outdated and unjust;

"Whereas Canada has ratified standards of civil and human rights in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the UN declaration of human rights, these rights are denied to persons affected by secrecy provisions in adoption laws of the Child and Family Services Act and other acts in Ontario;

"Whereas 10% of persons in Ontario are directly affected and 20% are indirectly affected by restricted rights to personal identifying information on themselves and on birth and adoptive relatives in the Ontario Child and Family Services Act and other acts;

"Whereas the birth certificate issued to an adopted person is a legally sanctioned erroneous document;

"Whereas the current system for disclosure of adoption information is discriminatory, psychologically cruel and expensive, with an unacceptably long waiting list for indeterminate results;

"Whereas research shows that not knowing basic personal information has proven harmful to adopted persons, birth parents and other birth and adoptive relatives,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario to enact revision of the Child and Family Services Act and other acts to move as quickly as possible to permit unrestricted access to full personal identifying information to adopted persons, adult children of adopted persons, birth parents, birth siblings and other birth relatives when the adopted person reaches age 18; permit access to identifying information to adoptive parents of minor children and emancipated minor adoptees; allow adopted persons and birth parents to file a notice stating their wish for non-contact; eliminate mandatory reunion counselling; encourage and support client self-determination; permit access to agency and court files when original statistical information is insufficient for identification of and contact with birth relatives; and recognize open adoptions in the law."

The petition is signed by a number of my constituents and I have affixed my signature.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should



not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

This petition is signed by some 74 permanent and seasonal residents of my constituency and I have affixed my signature thereto.

**Mr Paul Wessenger (Simcoe Centre):** I have a petition similar to the last one, addressed to Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a petition that I've been asked to read by the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. It reads as follows:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

#### LANDFILL

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition of 22 signatures from our riding of Dufferin-Peel. It's addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the recent announcement by the NDP government to choose three superdumps within the greater Toronto area has disturbed and upset local residents; and

"Whereas these superdumps might have been prevented if Bill 143 had allowed the Interim Waste Authority to look at all alternatives during the site selection process; and

"Whereas we would like to ensure the province of Ontario is making the best decisions based on all the facts regarding incineration and long rail-haul and

garbage management,

"We demand that the NDP government of Ontario repeal Bill 143, disband the IWA and place a moratorium on the process of finding a landfill to serve all of the greater Toronto area until all alternatives have been properly studied and debated."

I fully support this petition and I am signing it.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I too have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario from the seniors at Twin Elms in Strathroy, who petition:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and the owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlords,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

I have most certainly signed this petition.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mrs Joan M. Fawcett (Northumberland):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the Ontario Federation of Hunters and Anglers' advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I have signed the petition.

1520

#### VIDEO GAMES

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** I am pleased to present the following petition, which has been signed by 659 people in the cities of Waterloo, Brantford, Arthur, Kitchener, Guelph, Cambridge, Heidelberg and Burford. It reads as follows.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Theatres Act was amended in 1981 with the intention of keeping certain viewing materials away

from children and advances in technology have occurred to such an extent that the concern for children by this legislation is negated, as it does not cover electronically produced images that are part of video and computer games; and

"Whereas there has been a disturbing increase in the proliferation of violent and sexually explicit video games; and

"Whereas the government of Ontario should be making every effort to regulate the distribution of adult video games and ensure that games designed for adults are clearly marked as such; and

"Whereas Bill 135, the Theatres Amendment Act, 1993, a private member's bill introduced by Waterloo North MPP Elizabeth Witmer, would amend the definition of 'film' so that the electronically produced images that are part of video and computer games come within the purview of the act, particularly the classification system;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 135 be passed by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as quickly as possible."

I would be pleased as well, of course, to sign this petition.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr Noel Duignan (Halton North):** I have a petition from the Georgetown and District Seniors' Association which is also addressed to the Minister of Health.

"Whereas Halton Hills is a community of 38,000 in the northernmost part of the region of Halton and is made up of a large rural area and several small urban areas, with Georgetown and Acton being the largest, 17% of the population are age 55 or over, and the fastest growth in the population is in the 75-plus age group; and

"Whereas there is a crisis in long-term care in our community; and

"Whereas Halton Hills is an underserved community both in community services and long-term care beds"—if I may add, an area which was totally ignored by the previous governments;

"There are three proposals before your government at this time, all critically needed to improve services in our community for seniors and persons with disabilities. They include a support services proposal, a supportive housing proposal, a proposal to reinstate 57 nursing home beds in the mental health care centre and a proposal to establish two senior centres.

"Therefore, the community of Halton Hills urgently needs to implement these four projects. We recognize that the Minister of Health has many other urgent matters to attend to, but respectfully request that you please give it a share of your attention and give favourable consideration to these proposals."

It is a petition I gladly sign my name to.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### TIME ALLOCATION

Mr Charlton moved government notice of motion number 24:

That pursuant to standing order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order of the House relating to Bill 143, An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and to amend the Education Act in respect of French-Language School Boards, when Bill 143 is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment;

That the standing committee on resources development shall meet to consider the bill on its regularly scheduled meeting days commencing Wednesday, April 13, 1994. All proposed amendments shall be filed with the clerk of the committee by 12 pm on the last day of clause-by-clause consideration. At 4 pm on that day, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved and the Chair of the committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto. Any divisions required shall be deferred until all remaining questions have been put and taken in succession with one 20-minute waiting period allowed pursuant to standing order 128(a); that the committee be authorized to continue to meet beyond its normal adjournment if necessary until consideration of clause-by-clause has been completed. The committee shall report the bill to the House no later than Monday, April 25, 1994. In the event that the committee fails to report the said bill by the date provided, the bill shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House;

That upon receiving the report of the standing committee on resources development, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, which question shall be decided without debate or amendment, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading.

That one hour be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill. At the end of that time, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment.

That in the case of any division relating to any proceedings on the bill, the division bell shall be limited to five minutes and no deferral of any division pursuant to standing order 28(g) shall be permitted.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** Just before I make a few opening remarks, the House leaders have discussed this matter and we've agreed, I believe, that I will make some very brief opening remarks, that the government will reserve five minutes for the end of this debate and that the two opposition parties will split the remaining time.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Agreed? Agreed.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** I will be very brief in my comments this afternoon.

This piece of legislation, as my motion has indicated, will amend the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton legislation and some aspects of the Education Act relating



to school services in the Ottawa-Carleton area. It is the government's intention, after significant consultation with parties in the Ottawa-Carleton area, that this legislation should be in place for the municipal elections this fall.

It is always unfortunate when time allocation becomes the process by which we have to proceed to deal with legislation, but unfortunately we have a couple of members of this Legislature who have made it absolutely clear that this bill will not pass quickly and be in place for that election this fall.

Since there is a significant body of support in the Ottawa-Carleton region for seeing this legislation in place, the government wishes to proceed to complete this legislation and to allow the officials in the Ottawa-Carleton region to proceed to put in place the required changes to their enumeration process and the electoral process for this November to ensure the implementation of the wishes that are set out by the regional council of Ottawa-Carleton.

In that respect, we are therefore proceeding with this time allocation motion to move this bill into committee over the next couple of weeks to deal with the question of public input around this legislation. In that respect, the committee will have its opportunity to make its decisions about spending time in Ottawa hearing from the local groups that those members have referred to so frequently during this debate, and to receive their input before proceeding with clause-by-clause and returning to this Legislature some three weeks hence and proceeding to complete the legislation with whatever amendments might arise through that process.

In that respect, although the use of this process is unfortunate, from time to time we have to use it and we're using it in a fashion that will ensure the consultation with those groups in Ottawa-Carleton that do have an interest in making presentations around this legislation, to ensure that both the government and the opposition parties clearly hear the will of the people of Ottawa-Carleton.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Pursuant to an agreement, we will now proceed, with shared time, with the two opposition parties on the government's notice of motion number 24 by Mr Charlton.

1530

**Mr Hans Daigeler (Nepean):** I seem to sense from the government House leader, the member for Hamilton Mountain, a certain feeling that he is holding his nose in terms of what he is moving here and what he is forcing on the Legislature. At least I hope so, because how the government House leader can come here with a straight face and, without blushing, announce the most draconian shutting up of the opposition that I've seen in the six years that I now have been in this House, I think is really beyond belief.

As I say, I did sense in the minister's remarks a sense of his own embarrassment that he has to cover up for the incompetence and ineptitude of the current Minister of Municipal Affairs and of his colleague the member for Ottawa Centre.

However, he did have the gall, I think, to indicate that

it was because of opposition members that he has to do what he is doing. I will be speaking to that at some length despite the objections of the government House leader, but let me say first, even in terms of a closure motion and even in terms of a guillotine motion, the motion that's before us is the most draconian I've ever seen.

When you take a look at your agenda, and I happen to carry these things with me because we have to go to a lot of meetings, today, we have April 7, and according to this motion, this bill that was just introduced for first reading, I would insist, in midsession, is supposed to receive a concluding debate on second reading, go out to public hearings, as is the normal procedure in this House and is the right of the public to be informed about a legislative project by the government, and then to comments on the proposal by the government. That is the way it's supposed to be. So that has to happen: consultation of the public.

Then the committee normally takes a look, as it should, rereads what it has heard from the public, gives some time to the researchers of the legislative committee to put forward summaries of what it has heard from the public, then normally the parties are given an opportunity to review and make proposals for amendments that are coming out as a result of the public hearings. All of that, as you can understand, takes some time because these are important and substantive matters and you can't just do these things overnight.

Finally, what normally happens is it then comes back to the House as a report from the committee and there is further discussion and debate in this Legislature in what's called committee of the whole. Then members of the government and members of the opposition can make amendments, and they can speak to why they're proposing these amendments, and they can review again and put on the record their views. The government can do the same, say why it feels it has to proceed in the way it should, and that's the way we have had the process working in this province for a long time.

All of this work that I've described is supposed to be completed—today is April 7—within two weeks, on April 25. I really think we have to hear again what this motion really reads. Anybody who's a friend of democracy will be in utter shock and disbelief that such a motion would be coming forward from the government, and from an NDP government on top of that.

At every step of the way, this motion excludes, limits, cuts off debate.

It says:

"That the standing committee on resources development shall meet to consider the bill on its regularly scheduled meeting days commencing Wednesday, April 13, 1994. All proposed amendments shall be filed with the clerk of the committee by 12 pm on the last day of clause-by-clause consideration. At 4 pm on that day, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved and the Chair of the committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill

and any amendments thereto.”

Further on it says:

“The committee shall report the bill to the House no later than Monday, April 25,” and that’s in two weeks. “In the event that the committee fails to report the said bill by the date provided, the bill shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House.” Emasculation of the committee structure of the House.

“That upon receiving the report of the standing committee on resources development, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith”—again no debate—“which question shall be decided without debate or amendment, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading.”

And finally is the most galling, I think, provision in this particular motion, one that I haven’t heard of before and is certainly the lowest that I’ve seen in quite some time in terms of House procedure:

“That one hour be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill.” One hour on a bill that isn’t just of importance and significance to the people for Ottawa-Carleton, but that has great implications for all municipal governments in the province because it is taking away some very basic and fundamental rights and responsibilities of lower-tier municipalities. That’s what this government is doing and that’s why it is very important that we draw the attention of the public to what is happening. And that’s why I’m fundamentally and forcefully opposed to this particular motion and I encourage members of the House to vote against it.

Now, I know that the government has a majority. However, I’m no longer so sure as to whether all the members of the government and all the members of the NDP caucus are going to support the minister, because we have certainly seen at committee level and at other opportunities that there are at least some members of the NDP caucus who have a sense of understanding of local government and what it means to the people, and they understand that at least the public should have an opportunity to express itself, first of all, through its elected members in the House and, secondly, an opportunity to address, as is the custom, as is normal—there’s nothing unusual about it; as is the custom and as is normal—a legislative committee and to appear before the committee and to speak its mind.

There is some opportunity for public hearings still in Ottawa-Carleton, and certainly on this side of the House we have been pushing as much as we could to make sure that at least there would be a minimal—and I say it’s going to be a minimal opportunity for the public in Ottawa-Carleton to express its views on the bill because the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in some of the interjections that he made earlier on in the debate, said, “Well, the public has had lots of opportunity to express its views.” Well, they’ve had opportunities, but never, never on this bill that’s before this House, never even on the bill that was on the order paper before. When was there an opportunity for the public to properly address the Legislature through a committee of the Legislature on Bill 77? It wasn’t there, and the key provisions of Bill 77 were not proposed by the studies that preceded the

minister’s project. So the public of Ottawa-Carleton, according to the normal process of this House, has not had a proper opportunity to express itself. It is shameful that with this guillotine motion, the NDP would further limit and shut up the public of my area, and in so doing, prevent the public of the whole province from being heard.

1540

The member for Durham East earlier on this afternoon said to me that he had never seen me so worked up as I was speaking yesterday on this particular bill, and he’s absolutely right. I feel very, very strongly and very forcefully about this matter, because it could have been done in a very different fashion.

What is absolutely incredible is the amount of sheer ignorance that is coming across from the government side, that is coming from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and from the member for Ottawa Centre. I can only conclude, certainly from the member for Ottawa Centre, because she is from the area—the Minister of Municipal Affairs is from Toronto and perhaps he doesn’t know, even though he should, that there are different municipalities in Ottawa-Carleton and they feel different from each other, as is quite understandable and reasonable, and that normally they sit down and work things out together, but the member for Ottawa Centre ought to know better.

When she goes around, as she did yesterday, saying, “Oh, the people of Ottawa-Carleton are in favour,” as did the minister—the minister said, “The people of Ottawa-Carleton are in favour,” and he quoted as evidence the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade, for example—it’s just an utter and unbelievable ignorance of what the real feeling is of the people of Ottawa-Carleton.

I say, and I said that during the debate so far, that there are others even in my municipality—mind you, few, but there are others—who feel differently than I do, who feel differently than the council of my municipality, who feel differently than the police services board in my municipality. However, to say as the Minister of Municipal Affairs did and as the member for Ottawa Centre did, who should know better, that the majority of the people of Ottawa-Carleton support and can’t wait for this project to pass, is simply showing an abysmal lack of straightforward knowledge of even the correspondence they have received.

I have personally seen copies of the letters that have been sent to the minister from my own riding, and it was a stack like that. And the minister says, “Oh, well, there hasn’t been much opposition.” I can only conclude that the minister has not read his correspondence. That’s why we must have and we should have, and unfortunately we won’t have, because this government’s going to have its way, more opportunity for the public to be heard, because the minister obviously doesn’t know what’s going on and the member for Ottawa Centre doesn’t want to know what’s going on. I’m sure she knows. She knows the objection that is out there in Nepean certainly, in my municipality and in other parts of the province.

I tried, for example, to get information from the minister’s office as to who has written to him. I phoned.



Several times my staff phoned: "How many people have written to the minister? How many people are in favour? How many people are against?" If he could say to me, "Okay, the vast majority of those who have written to me, here's the number, are in favour of my project," fine, but I haven't received an answer. If the minister wants to see and have the record of the calls that were made by my staff to his staff, I will gladly provide him that.

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** You asked for names. Be truthful. You asked for names.

**Mr Daigeler:** I asked for the number of people—

**Hon Mr Philip:** You did not. You asked for names.

**Mr Daigeler:** We certainly did. Your staff said they were going to get back to us, and they never did. They didn't say, "We can't give you any names," or "It's confidential." They simply said, "We'll get back to you," and they never did, despite repeated phone calls, again and again, to the minister's office.

But I know myself that the minister has received, I'm sure, hundreds and hundreds of letters, certainly from my municipality and I would expect from other parts of the Ottawa-Carleton region as well, and I'm sure most of them, or very many of them, were strongly opposed to this provision.

I grant him that he received the support of the mayor from Ottawa; no doubt about it. Clearly, the mayor of Ottawa and the member from Ottawa Centre have been forcefully behind this initiative, and I think that's where it's coming from. I'm under no illusions whatsoever that it is the mayor of Ottawa who got together, surprisingly enough, with the NDP member from Ottawa Centre and said, "Really ideally, we want one-tier government, but we can't have that so we'll take the next best thing."

**Hon Mr Philip:** You figure the member for Ottawa Centre was at that meeting as well?

**Mr Daigeler:** It's difficult to understand and to listen to the interjections of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The member for Nepean has the floor very legitimately.

**Mr Daigeler:** The minister is making interjections. That's precisely why I would like to have more opportunity for him to speak in this House and to express himself and to make his arguments. What he's doing with this motion—and that's what we're debating right now—is he's trying to shut us up and he's even trying to shut himself up. Now he has to come in and interject and try to put forward his views in that way.

I say to the minister, if you want to be on the record, give us the time, address the public either in this House or, better still, come with us to Ottawa-Carleton and speak to the people there, speak to the public there properly in the way it should be done.

As I said, there are going to be two weeks with this motion that we're discussing, with this guillotine motion—because no other name could properly describe this motion that's before us. With this motion, we have two weeks to do all the work that I described earlier.

Obviously, even if we have hearings in Ottawa-Carleton, there will be very little opportunity for the

public to be heard, so I think it's going to be proper and right that I put on the record still at least a few of the comments that I have received from the public, to make sure that at least these people have an opportunity to have been listened to and to be on the record of the Legislature in this province.

But before I do so, I want to say, and forcefully say again, that I really am offended by the comments that have been coming from across this floor by people who said that I or the people of Nepean ought to be more open to the region of Ottawa-Carleton, ought to be less parochial and we should cooperate with others. I really take offence at that accusation because it's a pernicious one. Really, that's the approach of blaming the victim for—

**Hon Mr Philip:** Who said that?

**Mr Daigeler:** "Who said that?" the Minister of Municipal Affairs asks. His own parliamentary assistant said that. He said it yesterday in this House and he said it before during the debate.

**Hon Mr Philip:** Not in those words.

**Mr Daigeler:** He certainly did so.

1550

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. Address the Chair.

**Mr Daigeler:** Mr Speaker, yes, I should address the Chair, but since the Minister of Municipal Affairs keeps interjecting, and keeps falsely interjecting things, I have to respond to some of the points that are coming from across the floor.

What I'm saying is that we in Nepean had made, we are prepared to make and we will continue to make our contribution to regional government and to the overriding good of the people of Ottawa-Carleton. Okay? I want to have this very, very clear on the record that we have shown that we are prepared to work with others and that we are prepared to take the wider perspective and the wider interest into consideration. I think that's very, very clear.

I'm offended. I take strong objection to any kind of accusation that my municipal council or that I myself or the people in Nepean or the Nepean Chamber of Commerce or the Nepean Police Services Board, all the leading people in Nepean, are parochial, that they are looking only after their own interests. We have, as I said yesterday, for many years directly elected our regional councillors because, yes, we want some clear responsibility and accountability for the affairs of the region.

As I say, the regional councillors in Nepean have been elected city-wide, they've had to run as regional councillors for a long time, and we've had that responsibility and that accountability for many years. I think that through their work we have clearly shown that we have the interests of the region at heart, but we want to do that through cooperation and not coercion.

Yes, we would have been prepared to sit down and make some arrangements. Frankly, I don't think that there is that much of a mood out there—the minister falsely said, in my opinion, that a lot of people are really, really keen to restructure and reorient the system in Ottawa-

Carleton. Only if it clearly shows that there's going to be savings. I think that's something that hopefully is going to be listened to by the minister if there are hearings, even if they're short hearings, in Ottawa-Carleton, that he will hear that the people of Ottawa-Carleton want reforms but they want reforms that are cost-efficient, reforms only if they're going to save them some money and don't just change things for the sake of changing.

That's where, certainly in my city, the people are not convinced at all, that there are going to be significant savings through the minister's initiatives, but there might have been some and the people would have been prepared to listen to facts and figures and studies that the minister put forward in terms of why, for example, a regional police service would save really substantive moneys to the city of Nepean. But we have seen, in terms of the studies that have been done, that in fact the opposite is the case, that there's a very real possibility that we are going to pay more and that we're going to have less service; that's on the police side. We're going to probably pay for some of the liabilities that the Ottawa police service has, and on top of it, people are really afraid of losing some of the community policing that they presently proudly have in Nepean.

This afternoon we were talking about the significance and the importance of community policing and people being there and being seen in the community. Our police service has placed a great focus on that type of policing in Nepean. We are very proud that it's been working and we are seriously afraid of losing that closeness and that approach by a total amalgamation of all the police services in Ottawa-Carleton.

On the political side, some of the proponents of the minister's proposal have said, "We need to have fewer politicians in order to save money." Again, what we're seeing in Nepean is that we're going to have more rather than less politicians. So where is the saving?

Right now in my city there are 110,000 people and we have a council of seven people. I don't think that's too many. Compare that number with any municipality in the province and I don't think you're going to find many that, for a city that size, 110,000 thousand people, have only seven politicians. I don't think you can accuse us in Nepean of being overgoverned. I think it works well. Out of these seven, I would like to insist, three are also representing the interests of Nepean and the interests of the whole region at regional government.

There are three ward councillors, there are three councillors who are elected to the region and who are also representing the city-wide interests at Nepean city hall and then there's the mayor, the seventh member. I ask you, is that being overgoverned? It certainly isn't. But with the provisions that this minister is putting in place we're going to have three regional councillors, who are going to be on their own, and then on top of that we're going to have at least seven local municipal councillors, together with the mayor. So we're going to have more politicians rather than less.

Also, some of the proponents, I think in particular from Ottawa, have been saying there's going to be a saving in terms of the salaries that are being paid to the

politicians. I think we're going to be surprised when and if we do go to Ottawa-Carleton. I certainly hope that the committee will decide to go to Ottawa-Carleton. Certainly my caucus will be taking that strong position and I'm sure the Conservative Party will do the same, that we will have at least some minimal hearings in Ottawa-Carleton.

I'm sure that what we're going to hear there from the people is the view that already there's a very strong argument being made that the councillors at the region should be full-time, and I hear many of the councillors of the city of Ottawa also saying that they ought to be full-time and that they all ought to be paid a full-time salary, and that on top of that they all ought to have some staff so that they could do their work.

I am very, very concerned that all that will simply add up to another very large and very expensive political structure and that the savings that the minister has been promising us and that the government has been promising us are not going to be seen anywhere. In fact, instead of savings, we're going to see substantial higher costs, and that's what the people of Nepean, and I'm sure of many of the other municipalities, are objecting to.

The member for Ottawa Centre yesterday said in this House, and I couldn't believe my ears when I heard it, that we in Nepean, the opposition members and those people who are against it, are afraid of change, that we only want to do things the old way. My answer to that—I'm sure that if she's going to be there and is going to listen to the people, not just of her own riding but from other parts of the region as well, she's going to hear this—is that what we want is clear evidence of savings and that these reforms are going to improve the situation rather than make it worse.

There's the very, very I think substantiated view in Nepean that with the removal of the mayor from council, with the total dissociation of regional councillors from the local council, it's going to cost us more, that the real control over the financial affairs of the region is going to rest simply with the chairman of the region. That's what the people in my municipality are afraid of, and it's not because of a fear of change. They have not seen and they are not reassured in any way, shape or form that the project is really going to save them money.

As I said, because there will be so few opportunities to address a legislative committee, even if it goes to Ottawa-Carleton, I think I should at least put on the record the comments of a few of the people who have shared their remarks with me.

1600

By the way, I also have a letter from the city of Toronto. Yesterday in the debate, the minister said I was mistaken in saying that the Association of Municipalities of Ontario was against this project. Here I have a letter from the city of Toronto, signed by the city clerk. It says:

"City council, at its meeting held on December 13 and 14...gave consideration to clause 38, contained in Report No 1 of the executive committee, entitled Bill 77, An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton: Possible Implications on City of Toronto...."



"Council amended and adopted the clause, and in so doing took the following action:

"1. Requested the Minister of Municipal Affairs to withdraw Bill 77....

"2. Forwarded this report to the six Metro-area councils for their information and endorsement.

"3. Forwarded a copy of this report to the Committee of Metro Local Area Councils...for any joint action they may wish to pursue regarding Bill 77.

"4. Forwarded a copy of this report to the GTA mayors' committee for its information."

That's just one, and I would say a rather significant, member of the municipalities across the province. I've received many other similar copies of motions that were passed by municipal councils.

However, I do have to put on the record the views of some of the people in my own riding and in my own city of Nepean. For example, the chairman of the Nepean Seniors Advisory Council, Ruby Elver, wrote to the minister, objecting very strongly to the provisions of Bill 77. I say this during this debate on the closure and the guillotine motion because, unfortunately, people such as Ruby Elver will have to compete with many, many others from across the region—and there are 600,000 people in the region of Ottawa-Carleton—to be heard within perhaps two, three days of hearings, maximum. So at least I want to give her an opportunity to be heard in this way, since the government is trying to shut us up with this motion that's before us.

Here's what the chairman of the Nepean Seniors Advisory Council says:

"The Nepean Seniors Advisory Committee is seriously concerned about the impact of Bill 77 on various aspects of Nepean's ability to address the needs within its own boundaries. Especially, we oppose:

"(a) Removal of local mayors from regional council—a first in local government across Canada;

"(b) Suspension of right to determine ward composition—a right held by every other municipality in Ontario;

"(c) New regional ward boundaries which cross municipal boundaries and ignore true representation by population. The possibility exists for an inequitable balance of power in favour of one municipality;

"(d) Changes which financially burden Nepean, which has had a pay as you go policy."

I have another letter here, from Charles and Eleanor Jones, 58 Tybalt Crescent in Nepean. Here's what they said, and this is a letter to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Ed Philip:

"Your letter in the local papers on February 7, 1994, regarding your persistence to proceed with Bill 77 has caused us great distress. The citizens of Nepean have not endorsed this bill; in fact, the majority of Nepeanites are strongly opposed to this bill. The three studies on regional government have not been supported by the city of Nepean or its citizens.

"We cannot stand by and see the Nepean taxes increase. Nepean does not have the debt load of the other municipalities. The citizens of Nepean have paid their

share of taxes to reach the state of no debt and vehemently oppose any bill that will require us to assume the debt burden of other municipalities.

"The cost of \$10 million to establish a regional police force in these times of restraint is ludicrous. The Nepean city police force is a first-rate unit and should not be tampered with," and this letter goes on and on. I can't read all of it but here it concludes:

"It is inconceivable for a government so deeply in debt that they have to lay off workers and close health facilities to even consider spending the millions of dollars that this bill will cost to implement."

These are people who most likely will not be getting an opportunity to address the Legislature and to address their representatives because of this draconian closure and guillotine motion that is before us today.

I have another rather interesting letter before me. It's from Donald Wigfield and he also lives in Nepean. Guess what he says? I find what he has to say rather interesting.

"I, and many others thought, that with the election of an NDP government in Ontario the views of ordinary citizens would finally be listened to." Listen to what Mr Wigfield now says. "As one who has even campaigned for your party (in your riding)"—this letter is addressed to Ms Gigantes—"I am bitterly disappointed in the arrogant approach so far exhibited by you and your government in the matter of Bill 77.

"I, and many others, have written to your minister Mr E. Philip, we have signed and sent petitions; our municipality has done likewise. All we hear from your minister is a loud silence and an irrelevant form letter. He has not thought it worthwhile to attend the public meetings organized in Nepean so that he could hear the views of residents. Apparently, the minister does not wish to listen. To us it appears that both you and he are in the pocket of Ottawa Mayor Holzman, and he is simply wishing to score political points rather than listen to the legitimate concerns of the ordinary people. I enclose a copy of my letter to the minister.

"Your performance"—and Mr Wigfield is talking about the performance of Ms Gigantes, the member for Ottawa Centre and the Minister of Housing—"in this matter is also one of cruel disappointment to me. In opposition you had appeared to me to be a politician of integrity and one who took the trouble to find out what ordinary people felt about things. The people of Nepean are proud to belong to Nepean; they feel that they have been well governed and represented; and they have very legitimate reasons for not wanting to be forced to belong to an impersonal larger unit with a record of very poor and irresponsible government."

At the end of his letter, Mr Wigfield says:

"It is sad to see what has happened to you"—meaning Ms Gigantes—"and to a government that was elected, at least in part, because ordinary people hoped that their voice would be listened to a little more. It is sad to see you and your government so insensitive, so unlistening, and apparently so uncaring. Wake up, Ms Gigantes; look in the mirror, and see what you have become. It is not too late to begin believing in the things you once

believed in and articulated so well."

Now, that's what I call a pretty clear, direct and forthright letter from, as Mr Wigfield said, even a supporter of the current government.

1610

Again, I think it's very important that this House and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Housing be made aware of these views, because yesterday and in the debate before they showed an absolutely incredible, abysmal lack of information and knowledge about the real feelings of the people in the region about this project. That's why it is so unfortunate that after two days of debate so far on this project we are seeing a most draconian guillotine motion before us that cuts debate short in a way that is unheard of in this Legislature.

By the way, even people from Ottawa are not necessarily in favour and in support of what the minister is proposing, because perhaps at least they have a sense of respecting the individual history and the individual government that we have in the suburban municipalities of Ottawa-Carleton.

For example, Councillor Peter Harris for the Dalhousie ward, by way of concluding, says, "I am requesting that you not support the proposed changes to Ottawa-Carleton as this is not a good piece of legislation." That's coming from Ottawa.

"Costs: Projected costs will be \$1.8 million to employ 18 full-time councillors with office budgets.

"At the city of Ottawa, councillors are full-time. Their remuneration, which includes regional duties, is \$57,000. Our office budgets are \$60,000 per councillor.

"At \$50,000 per full-time regional councillor plus \$50,000 for office budgets, the costs are \$1.8 million.

"Minister Ed Philip could not tell me where this money is to be found. Is it not ironic, that after a tumultuous 'social contract' year in 1993, that the NDP government can justify an additional \$1.8 million expenditure?"

This is what a councillor for the city of Ottawa says. Again, the member for Ottawa Centre and the Minister of Municipal Affairs have said the people in Ottawa-Carleton and in Ottawa have been clamouring for reform. Well, here's what the councillor for the Dalhousie ward says:

"My constituents are concerned about too much government, and too much confusion. I have not received one phone call on the apparent need for regional reform.

"Citizens are more concerned with the reduction of costs in government.

"Let me assure you that the proposed political changes will only create more confusion, and politicians at all levels will be spending the next few years explaining the different responsibilities of city vs regional representatives. Good luck!"

This is a councillor from the city of Ottawa.

My point is that all of these people ought to be given and should have been given a proper opportunity to be heard and to express their views to their representatives, and I would say in particular to the Minister of Municipal

Affairs, because all he has done so far is come down to Ottawa-Carleton and speak to some of the politicians, and that was many months ago.

When the famous announcement was made in February that this government was going to pass this legislation and announce this in a way that totally overlooked and disregarded the work that needs to be done by this Legislature, who was there? It was the member for Ottawa Centre and, of course, in tow was the mayor of Ottawa.

I found this, frankly, very, very disturbing, that everybody else didn't know about the press conference at the time, but certainly the mayor of Ottawa was informed. We know why the mayor of Ottawa was informed; it's the project of the member for Ottawa Centre and it's the project of the city of Ottawa.

If the Minister of Municipal Affairs would at least come and speak to and listen to and talk to people in the other municipalities, I'm sure he and his parliamentary assistant wouldn't at least make some of the outrageous, ignorant statements they have made that these reforms are widely supported in the region.

Again yesterday in the debate, the Minister of Housing made some comments about a letter that she and all the members of this House received from the Citizens for Good Government. This is a letter which is quite long, and again speaks in strong opposition. I can say to the minister that several of the people who have signed this letter speak not just for themselves, but for associations; for example, Kim Millan, the president of the Barrhaven Community Association. Tom O'Neill, who also signed this letter, is the past president of the Barrhaven Community Association. There are six signatures on this letter. I do not know the exact office of the other people who have signed this letter because they are from other parts of the region. They're from the east, and some from the southern part of the region, but certainly the ones who are from my community do not speak just for themselves; they speak officially as the elected representatives of their communities. Again, I certainly hope they will be given an opportunity to speak at some length to their views.

If the minister and the Minister for Housing have questions about the representativity of these people who have written to all of us, they can ask them. They can ask them those questions at the time, and I'm sure they will be very pleased to answer those questions.

Again, the minister is saying, if I understand him right, that he will. I hope he will. I certainly hope that he will be there, because he hasn't been so far. He hasn't been once to Nepean, and it's a city of 110,000 people. I think it's time for him to come and at least face the people in a forthright manner on this project in our city.

I have another letter from a gentleman in my riding who has written numerous times to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I don't know whether he will have an opportunity under the very tight and short schedule that this guillotine motion is putting forward to present his views, but here's what Dr A.G. Irvine of 30 Aleutian Road in Nepean said in a letter, this time to me:



1620

"I attach a copy of the reply of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to my letter of September 14, 1993, which set out my objections to the above bill," meaning Bill 77. "While this reply is dated February 16, 1994, I only recently received it.

"I strongly object to the contents of this letter, one reason being that it ignores the many defects of the Kirby study. The Kirby study acknowledged the public's rejection"—rejection—"of one-tier government but still recommended the transfer of as many functions as possible to the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. As a result, this study concentrated on inputs, procedures and the transfer of functions to the RMOC," meaning the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, "rather than considering the outputs of municipal services, access to these services, their costs, value for money and the burden of taxation in Ottawa-Carleton. These points were explained in detail in a letter of January 8, 1993, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in which I set out my comments on the final report of the Ottawa-Carleton regional review.

"Another reason for my objecting to the contents of this letter from the minister is that it ignores the contents of my letter of September 14, 1993. In this letter, I pointed out that there was no need for a regional police force because existing police services in the region were excellent and because, in the present state of the economy, proposals involving additional costs and taxes were irresponsible. Moreover, the minister's justification for proceeding to establish a regional police service is that the costs of the free policing now provided to some Ottawa-Carleton municipalities should be transferred from provincial to regional taxpayers. This is an illogical argument: If it is inappropriate for these costs to be subsidized by provincial taxpayers, it is equally illogical for them to be subsidized by regional taxpayers in other municipalities in Ottawa-Carleton. The logical proposal, if subsidization is considered inappropriate, would be to require the municipalities in question to meet their costs of policing. Moreover, this logical proposal would eliminate the proposal for a regional police force and, of great importance, the organizational and financial problems of establishing such a force."

I think, in a very reasoned way, Dr Irvine put some of the views of the people in Ottawa on the record. Again, I do hope, because I wasn't able to read all of what he said, that he will have an opportunity to present his views to the standing committee on resources development when it comes to Ottawa-Carleton. But I doubt it, because the time that has been allocated under this guillotine motion that we have before us is extremely short and I'm sure there will be many, many people who will request to appear before the committee and that it's going to be extremely hard to accommodate all of these requests.

Because there are other members of my caucus who also wish to address this draconian motion that's before us, I will have to conclude shortly. I know the members of the third party will want to speak to this matter as well and indicate their disappointment and their utter frustra-

tion at the way this government, and in particular this current Minister of Municipal Affairs, has handled this dossier—has mishandled this dossier. They will want to say with me that it could have been done differently, that it could have been done in a way that does not pit one municipality against the other and that does not sour the relationship between the representatives of one municipality and the other, and that it is too bad and it is most unfortunate that today we have to vote on a motion that totally eliminates any further debate, or almost any further debate, on a very substantive measure that is going to have an impact far beyond the region of Ottawa-Carleton.

I'm sure the public in Ottawa-Carleton will be pleased to hear that at least the opposition parties and members of the opposition have been fighting for the interests of the people they serve, who have elected them to at least put their views on the record, even though they know the NDP government has a majority: not for much longer, but right now still has a majority and can impose its will on everybody else.

With these words, I will pass on the word to the other opposition party.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** It seems to me that I have the opportunity on many more occasions than I ever anticipated to speak on closure motions in this House. I was just discussing as I was going down the hallway with the dean of the parliamentary press gallery, Eric Dowd, the history of this place and the fact that on many occasions there were threats of closure that would be brought in, but closure was extremely rarely applied in debates in the Ontario Legislature. It used to be considered draconian, and I think many would still consider it to be that, but unfortunately it's becoming much more commonplace.

My concern is that of the member for Nepean and others, that debate on an extremely important issue is being significantly limited. I don't think I anticipated this debate would go on for days on end; I don't think anybody would have anticipated that. But I know all of the members who reside in the Ottawa-Carleton area would want to put their views on the record, would want to share with the people in this Legislature and with the people of the province of Ontario at large those views, and they're simply not going to have that opportunity.

In addition to this, as members have indicated previously in debate, there was a hope that there would be a considerable number of days available so that people in the Ottawa-Carleton area would be able to make their presentation to a committee of the Legislature. I think this would have been beneficial for a couple of reasons. We all benefit when people with expertise and particular points of view present those views to government and to opposition. Second, it does allow them, if you will, to vent their rage when they're dissatisfied, and others to express their support when they feel that support is worthy of their expression.

I have been concerned, as I know other members have been, particularly in the opposition and I suspect some in government, about the new Bob Rae rules for the House which were brought in a couple of years ago. I remember

I was getting a number of petitions on this particular issue at one time from people who understood the parliamentary process.

One of the problems we confront today is that virtually nobody in the Queen's Park media is going to be reporting the fact that there is closure being applied. The reason for that is it's an in-house story. Unless there's a major province-wide issue to go with it, the government today is allowed to bring in closure, and there are very few editorials—there might be the odd editorial, but very few comments and next to no news stories.

I've always said that you make a judgement on a government based on what it does when nobody is looking or what it does when it can get away with doing things that it normally wouldn't do. Now we have a situation where the government is once again applying closure so that there can't be as full a debate as I think is justified with this bill.

Our view in opposition is that it could have been dealt with, in fact, last session. My colleagues have expressed that if the government had wanted to call it as an earlier piece of legislation, that would be the case.

**Hon Mr Philip:** You tried to filibuster every other bill in the House.

1630

**Mr Bradley:** Now the Minister of Municipal Affairs is becoming angry and yelling from the other side of the House. I guess it's his prerogative to do so, but I think he does not look at this objectively. We in the opposition look at it very objectively, of course. We believe this bill, while it would have taken a few days of debate, certainly would have been one that wouldn't be before the House for several weeks.

But we have a change in the rules now since Bob Rae has come in power. I remember that the Bob Rae of official opposition, the Bob Rae who sat in the federal House of Commons, was a civil libertarian, was a person who defended the rights of the opposition, and we have today—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bradley:** The member for Middlesex doesn't like this being repeated because she used to believe this, likely, as well. Now she simply acts as government members tend to, I guess, wherever, as trained seals out there who simply applaud when fish are thrown to them. Now, I say that in as nice a way as I can, but that is what happens when the members on the other side simply sit there and defend that which is indefensible simply because they want to be good members of the government team. Well, that doesn't carry as much credibility as when the member for Welland-Thorold stands up, for instance, and indicates his opposition to closure. I would think the member for Welland-Thorold, who is in the House today, and the member for Wentworth East, who is in the House today, are both individuals who have been uncomfortable on the government benches, uncomfortable with the application of closure to put legislation through the House, not necessarily with the content of the legislation but with the application of closure.

We know that what Bob Rae has done—the Bob Rae

of the past; now what Premier Rae has done—is he's limited the amount of time that speakers can speak in the House. So we are limited to 30 minutes when in fact it may be such a compelling issue that it requires far more than 30 minutes to canvass the issue and to explain the issue to the public at large.

The reason that the opposition prolongs debate is so that the public is aware of these issues, because very often you will hear members of the public say: "We didn't even know that was before the House. When did this go through the House? When was this issue discussed?" Only with a thorough and comprehensive debate does it catch on with the public at large, who may have some genuine concerns, and then the appropriate questions are asked. But now we are all limited, except the lead speaker, to 30 minutes in most debates in this House, and that's most unfortunate.

I realize that we now have a situation where a minister can simply determine how much time will be devoted to any piece of legislation. It's in the minister's interests, of course, to get it through as quickly as possible with as little debate as possible so that only the government line can get out there and only the government spin can be put on any particular issue. So again I think it's dangerous that we have ministers now who have the ability to determine that a debate shall be over in three or four days in this House.

In fact, and this is disconcerting to those of us who sit in this House, most people think we're working only when we're in this House or when the House is in session. I think they like to see us debating these issues thoroughly, and eventually, of course, coming to a conclusion.

The other problem with the new rules that Bob Rae imposed on this House was that you, Mr Speaker, sitting in the chair, have less discretion in applying the rules of the House than you used to have, and the Speaker, as we know, is independent. In this House the most permanent Speaker, the lead Speaker, is a New Democrat elected from Scarborough.

In the case of the present Speaker in the chair, you're a member of the Progressive Conservative Party, Mr Villeneuve, and Mr Morin is a member of the Liberal Party, and whenever you sit in the chair you're considered to be politically neutral. That is very good about our system and I have faith in that, particularly with the three personalities that I've mentioned at this time. I then find it disconcerting that the Premier, under his new rules, has in fact removed from the Speaker the power to make certain decisions as to whether sufficient debate has taken place on any one issue.

Also, the Premier has insisted that the House sit fewer days, and so the regular calendar of sitting of the session of this Legislature has been reduced. This, of course, allows less accountability because the ministers do not have to face the opposition and their own members in question period, and do not face the reporters outside of the chamber, where they have to answer further questions, and of course do not find themselves on province-wide television where people can have access to what happens in this House through cable television and



therefore can make other judgements.

Also, I would say that the people who are in this House play a much lesser role because with these changes it passes more power into the hands of non-elected people; that is, those the member for Welland-Thorold once referred to as "pinheads from Toronto" or something like that; I can't recall the exact quote. I was watching a cable television program locally when he made this suggestion. I think there is some validity to it. I don't know if I would agree with the terminology "pinheads" or people exclusively in Toronto; I might or might not, depending on who they might be.

I think the point he made is a point we all agree with: that elected members should have supremacy over those who are not elected. The reason is simple. Any one of us from my city, for instance, from St Catharines—we have three members in the House today who represent parts of St Catharines. The member for Lincoln, the member for St Catharines-Brock and I all have to serve our constituents. They can get at us. They can telephone our constituency office. They have the threat or the persuasive tactic, if you will, of saying, "We will not re-elect you unless you reflect our views." So I think it's important that elected members are supreme.

What happens is that the cabinet with their civil servants and with their political experts, the Premier and the Premier's office, increase in power and the elected members diminish in their importance.

It's a little easier in opposition to be able to make your points in this House. For instance, today the way the time is allocated, virtually all of the time rests with the opposition and government members outside of the cabinet do not have the opportunity to speak. I feel that we underutilize government members who are not members of the cabinet and that they are the ones who are the greatest losers when we impose the kind of rules that Premier Rae has decided to impose on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and has done so in June of 1992.

I would hope there would be a change in those rules. I would hope we would not see the application of closure. Well, there's not a riot in the Legislature this afternoon. There's a recognition, as I say, that this is an in-House matter, that no editor is going to carry any story that anybody in the press gallery is going to send to that editor that has something to do with closure over the Ottawa bill, except of course it may be the Ottawa Citizen or one of the radio or television stations servicing Ottawa. In that case, there may be a small story about the use of closure.

That's why, in the government caucus, I think it's important for government members to persuade the Premier and their cabinet colleagues that in fact it is an inappropriate regime of rules that have been imposed by Premier Rae and that this particular closure motion was not necessary.

I just don't think that this debate—I'm not involved in a very detailed way in this issue because it's essentially an issue that affects the people in Ottawa-Carleton and I was quite surprised, frankly, to see that closure was imposed because I didn't think this bill was going to be

before the House very long. I knew that the local members wanted to ensure there was time for the people outside of this Legislature to have some input in Ottawa-Carleton; I knew that and I thought the government would be prepared to accommodate that, but I didn't think it was going to be necessary to spend time on a closure motion. In fact, this afternoon probably we could have spent the time discussing the actual details of the bill and its ramifications and could have spent some time, more time than the government has decided to allocate, for the purpose of having committees.

1640

The member for Hamilton East, again, who used to defend the rights of the opposition vigorously and sincerely, today sits there smugly—I will use that term—saying, "Who are you kidding?"

I think if you look at it carefully, since it is a matter that relates quite specifically to one sector of the province, one regional municipality, you could anticipate that the debate wouldn't have gone on for ever. There are times when the government may feel it has to move forward, and I understand that; I don't like it but I understand it. But I think the government has miscalculated today. I think they've needlessly imposed closure and of course the opposition and others will list the number of times that they've applied closure. They've done so relatively early in the session and relatively early in the debate.

I hope this experience will cause the government to think twice about applying closure again. I'm not optimistic that will be the case, because we're seeing a pattern developing of the imposition of closure.

I think for the sake of the people of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton who want to make representations to a government committee, for the sake of government members who are not in the cabinet who wish to have their role enhanced rather than diminished, and for the sake of the people in the opposition who have a role to constructively criticize and provide alternatives, that this should have been avoided and could have been avoided.

**The Acting Speaker:** This completes the time for the official opposition. Further debate? The members of the Progressive Conservative Party.

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I really didn't think that I would be debating this issue again today because I'd had some opportunity to offer my views and my concerns with regard to this bill. I was hoping that with the spirit of cooperation that had been demonstrated, particularly by our party in terms of passing on our rotation and not having a great number of speakers, that message maybe conveyed to the government that we really wanted to have this go to committee without closure and at that point to have a good, healthy discussion about the specific aspects of the bill, perhaps to entertain a number of amendments and hopefully then to achieve some consensus along with the people of Ottawa and the political representatives in Ottawa.

I have to echo some of the thoughts of the previous speakers. I think it's very unfortunate that we did have to

use this very difficult measure in terms of restricting time and I really think it could have been accommodated without—

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** They're in a rush to call an election.

**Mr David Johnson:** They're in a rush to call the election? Is that what it is? It's a funny way to go about it, I must say, but perhaps the member is correct in his statement.

Since this matter is before us again today and since the time is going to be very limited because of the closure motion that the government has brought in, I thought I might just comment on a couple of aspects that we would have discussed had we not had the closure motion, perhaps, and in a little more detail.

During some of the comments after I spoke, I got the impression that people speaking to the issue of the mayors being on the regional council felt that there was some question of the mayors' motivation for being on the regional council, that perhaps it was to serve their own purposes or it was for their own power base, and this was the only reason that the mayors were squawking that they wanted to be on the regional council.

I can tell you from my personal experience—I'm not so sure that this has come out—that the need to have a good working relationship between a local council and a regional council extends in a number of different jurisdictions.

Planning, for example, is one area. There are planning issues, the way our municipalities are set up today, that are broader planning aspects of the community: where the major roads should be, the major nodes, the major centres, commercial office space centres, that type of thing perhaps, and how transportation integrates with major planning areas. There are some regional aspects to planning and there are some local aspects to planning, many more. Of course, I think many of us here would feel that the local municipality should bear the brunt of the responsibility when it comes to planning. But nevertheless, most people can see that there are both regional and local aspects to planning. Consequently, there needs to be coordination.

My experience has been that with the mayors serving, for example, on the regional council here in Metropolitan Toronto, the mayors have brought that local aspect to the regional council and I think in many cases have brought the regional context back to the local councils. There is no other conveyor of that sort of information and that sort of feeling. Without the mayors being there, the process relies on bureaucrats interacting largely at both levels of government. In my view, it's doomed to hard times.

Transportation is another issue, and I mentioned that perhaps as part of planning. In most major urban centres there are regional roads; of course there's public transit; there's also a very local aspect, the local road system, the local traffic controls, that sort of thing. There needs to be quite a spirit of cooperation between local councils; in the case of Metro, for example, North York, East York with the Metropolitan Toronto council.

In the case of Ottawa-Carleton, local councils such as

Kanata, Nepean and Cumberland need to have a close working relationship so that the transportation grid, the road structure, any rail structure, bus services, for example, make sense both at a local level and at a regional level. Again the mayors are the people who bring the local context to the regional council and the regional context back to the local council. Without them, it's been my experience that this will become difficult.

Labour negotiations: You may not think of that, and perhaps the government doesn't want to think of that; I'm not too sure. A problem, from time to time, in one area, one region, can crop up if one municipality offers a settlement that is considerably out of whack with what other municipalities can afford. I know in Metropolitan Toronto the status of the labour negotiations at the local level, let's say in Scarborough or Etobicoke, is conveyed to the people at Metropolitan Toronto and the mayors convey the status of the labour negotiations back to their local municipalities so that everybody is aware of what's going on.

If there is a settlement that is going to cause considerable consternation, that may set a precedent in one municipality, say in the local municipalities vis-à-vis the regional municipality, then that kind of information is conveyed back and forth and that is information that is really required. The mayors are the conveyors of that kind of information, so they serve a real purpose as a liaison back and forth.

Waste management is another area. There needs to be a great coordination through, for example, the blue box recycling program which in some municipalities is funded by the regional government, operated by the local government; hazardous waste collection is quite often handled by regional government but in some cases by the local government.

There are many, many different issues that involve coordination between the two municipalities. I wish the government members would reflect on that, because in a region such as Ottawa-Carleton, those kinds of services will have to be well coordinated between the local and regional level. If the local and regional levels are not working together, then who will suffer? The taxpayers will suffer; the people will suffer because those services won't be delivered as efficiently and as effectively as they should be. I think the mayors serve an excellent role in ensuring that coordination. I just wanted to comment on that.

I also wanted to comment that I didn't get too deeply into economic development. This is certainly an issue that has been raised by the municipalities. Kanata, for example, has indicated that the minister should give permissive legislation in the amendment of the Ottawa-Carleton act to allow both local and regional governments to manage economic development through the purchase of industrial and commercial parks.

1650

Now, what we're talking about is the right of local municipalities to have some ability to encourage business growth within their borders. This is becoming a real problem for quite a number of municipalities. I'm sure we're all aware of this. Businesses are going bankrupt;



assessment bases are going down in many municipalities. It puts tremendous pressure on the tax rates, and many municipalities, including the municipality that I came from a year ago, are putting a great deal of importance on the aspect of economic development to encourage business.

With the Ottawa-Carleton region, the local municipalities currently have some authority to manage economic development, to purchase property and to encourage growth. This bill, Bill 143, would transfer this authority to the regional government. I don't dispute that the regional municipality needs some authority. I don't think anybody disputes that. Certainly the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton needs authority in the area of economic development. But the local municipalities, such as Kanata, such as Nepean, have had authority and power in this area in the past. They have used it wisely. They have attempted to encourage growth, jobs, assessment within their municipalities, and this power is apparently being taken away from them.

Nepean, I might say, agrees: "There should be permissive legislation to allow municipalities to acquire lands for economic development." The township of Rideau: "There should be more local input in the area of economic development." They say, "Once again it seems that local municipalities are losing key powers." I would have to agree with them, and I think in this case it's unfortunate.

The township of Cumberland: "Bill 77"—it's now Bill 143, of course—"Removal of the lower tier from management of economic development is not supported by the council of Cumberland. A joint participation by Cumberland and the new regional council would be an acceptable compromise." You see, here is a municipality that's coming forward with a suggestion, that's saying yes, the region, Ottawa-Carleton, needs some economic development authority, but there should be a joint participation and the local municipality should also retain its right and some power on economic development. I think that's very wise of them.

We didn't have much opportunity here; we're going to have very limited opportunity over the next three weeks, I guess it is, two or three weeks before this has to come back, to discuss economic development, but I would hope that the government would listen to that kind of concern from the municipalities.

Another area of concern that I hope they're listening to, and this is one that's perhaps been mentioned more often, concerns the coordination of police services. As we know, there are different approaches within the region for supplying police protection within the various municipalities.

Cumberland, for example, has support from the Ontario Provincial Police. Up until very recently they haven't paid for it. I think they're in the process right now perhaps of investigating—there will be a payment there.

Goulbourn receives Ontario Provincial Police assistance without any cost, as does Osgoode, as does Rideau, as does West Carleton. Kanata pays the OPP. Some of the others, such as Ottawa and Nepean, have their own police forces, and I believe Gloucester also has its own police force.

There are different methods of dealing with policing in different communities, and I believe the message that's coming across, and the message I wish we had more opportunity to explore, had we not had closure, would be that these communities are different. Ottawa is different from Kanata is different from Nepean is different from Cumberland is different from Rockcliffe Park etc etc and they have different requirements for policing.

Now, I'm not against coordination of police activities; I think it makes sense. I can tell you that here in Metropolitan Toronto it certainly makes sense. It would not make sense, in my view, for North York to have a police department and the city of Toronto to have a police department and Scarborough to have another police department and East York etc. That sort of situation occurred prior to 1954, I guess it was, when the police services were amalgamated here in Metropolitan Toronto.

But there certainly is a necessity for a coordinating police service within a region that is homogeneous, which has some uniformity to it, and certainly Metropolitan Toronto does. Metropolitan Toronto is largely an urban centre, although the member for Etobicoke West is not too certain, I think. But by comparison to Ottawa-Carleton, we're talking about a largely urban, built-up centre with a narrow range of needs. To a large extent, the needs in Scarborough are similar to the needs in policing—policingwise I'm talking about—in the city of Toronto or East York.

But in the case of Ottawa-Carleton, we're looking at very dissimilar communities, I think, and communities that have different needs from a policing point of view, and that's borne out by the situations that they have in place today. From what I understand, and I hope we have a chance to explore this further, many of these municipalities are satisfied. They're satisfied with the policing they're getting—Nepean, for example—satisfied with the level of service they're getting. They're satisfied with the cost associated: the cost, I might say, which, according to—I think it's the Marin report, René Marin's report of just about a year ago. The cost in Nepean per capita is about \$40 less than it is in the city of Ottawa: \$127 per capita in Nepean versus \$168 in the city of Ottawa. So they have tailored their police service to their community.

Concerns have come out of this, and the concern is that the government may institute a police service that is uniform right across this region, and the cost of that will be a problem for many of the smaller municipalities. They may not need the level of service that Ottawa gets, and if they're required to pay the cost of that sort of level of service, then this will be a problem for these municipalities. I hope the government is listening to this. With the time allocation, I'm not sure we're going to have the opportunity to explore this.

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** We're listening.

**Mr David Johnson:** You're listening. The member says they're listening. Great. Okay. We'll hold you to that, then, when it comes back in two weeks. If you were really listening, though—

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound):** You wouldn't be doing this.

**Mr David Johnson:** —you wouldn't be doing this, because we were showing cooperation and we were making good progress. We missed our rotation, and we were very much hoping that this would go to Ottawa and we'd listen to the people, that we'd be able to discuss this without having a time commitment, the time axe hanging over our necks, which is going to come down, when is it, April 25?

**Mr O'Connor:** Sometimes leadership doesn't mean we always agree.

**Mr David Johnson:** "Leadership is a tough thing," the member says. You can call it leadership or you can call it dictatorship. Democracy is a tough thing. It requires a little bit of time to talk to people. It's hard to ram in overnight.

**Mr Murdoch:** It's hard to have democracy with socialism.

**Mr David Johnson:** Getting back to the police, another concern with regard to the police is that some municipalities have any facilities paid for—

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** Maybe I'll give you one of those simple English history books.

**Mr David Johnson:** The member opposite is giving us a history lesson.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Please continue.

1700

**Mr David Johnson:** Where was that member from? Downsview. The member for Downsview won't get the opportunity to speak today, I guess, but during the hearings, hopefully, we'll have a history lesson on the Ottawa region from the member for Downsview.

Getting back to my point before I was interrupted, some municipalities have paid for their police facilities; as I understand it, there's zero debt associated with their facilities. Other municipalities have a debt associated with their facilities. The question is, how is this going to work out? Are the municipalities that have paid the freight up to now, paid their bills, covered all their costs, going to have to pick up the cost, the debt, from the other municipalities?

I think the government at one point gave some recognition to this, that there should be some assistance in terms of a phase-in to some of the municipalities for the cost of policing, but I don't know where it stands on that. I hope they will recognize that there are real concerns with regard to policing, with regard to costing, with regard to the requirement to have a uniform level, different needs in different municipalities, and there are different municipalities in the Ottawa-Carleton region.

Another concern that we really should explore in some detail if we had the time—let's see if I can find it here now. I didn't expect to speak on this this afternoon.

**Mr Perruzza:** Take your time, David.

**Mr David Johnson:** Take my time. The member for Downsview now says take my time. He gave me a history lesson before, but now I can take my time. Thank you.

It's with regard to infrastructure, and the member for

Downsview would be interested in infrastructure, I'm sure, coming from Metropolitan Toronto.

**Mr Perruzza:** What does that mean?

**Mr David Johnson:** It means sewers and watermains and roads and things like that. At least that's what most people—I don't know what this government calls infrastructure. There's some doubt about that sometimes, but it probably means supporting the operating cost of the budget.

**Mr Perruzza:** It's better to be clear about what we're talking about.

**Mr David Johnson:** In the case of Kanata, for example, Kanata has said that the minister should include permissive legislation in the amendments—sorry. Kanata is concerned about the vagueness of the bill's sewer provisions. The city recommends that any infrastructure costs and deficiencies in specific municipalities not be paid by the general taxpayer, and that the problem should be addressed by a special local levy.

What we're talking about here is that some municipalities in the Ottawa-Carleton region have conveyed the message that they have paid for the sewer systems, paid for the roads, paid for the watermains. They've put these into place and they're all paid for.

Other municipalities, perhaps through circumstances, through history, are not in such a fortunate position. I think the city of Ottawa is a case in point. I know that when we went to Ottawa recently—I'm not sure if the member for Downsview went to Ottawa—to discuss Bill 120, the mayor from Ottawa appeared in opposition, I might say, to Bill 120 before us and indicated that one of her concerns was that there are areas within Ottawa that do not have adequate sewer capacity and this causes backups in some of the basements.

The government's response was, well, they can just spend money and fix it so they can put in basement apartments. Bill 120 authorizes basement apartments, so that's no problem: Just spend whatever it takes to fix it up. It's easy to sit here and say that, but if you're at the local level and you have to come through with a budget that balances, and Ottawa has to balance its budget every year, and does so, and I'm sure they do it in an excellent fashion—

*Interjection.*

**Mr David Johnson:** Yes, to the member for Downsview, it costs money, and they don't have that money and they can't just fix all these problems overnight, and they're expensive. That's one of the reasons that Ottawa has concerns with regard to Bill 120. But it also points out the fact that there is undoubtedly a substantial investment that has to be made in the city of Ottawa with regard to sewers, and some municipalities, smaller municipalities, are wondering if through this bill, Bill 143, they will be required to foot that bill, or will that bill go back simply to the city of Ottawa?

The township of Cumberland says: "The sanitary and storm sewer issue has been described by the township as ambiguous. It is assumed that local sanitary sewer distribution system would remain a municipal responsibility, but new guidelines would be issued by the regional



authority on design and integration." So there's another concern. It's ambiguous, the township of Cumberland says, as to how much power in this act, Bill 143, is being transferred to the regional government, Ottawa-Carleton region, with regard to the design of the whole sewer system, not just what we might think of as major trunks, major collectors, but the local system.

**Mr Perruzza:** Resist change.

**Mr David Johnson:** The member for Downsview is suggesting that we should resist the change, I'm sure, in taking authority away from local municipalities to design to their own infrastructure: their own roads, their own sewers. If the change is that all of this authority go to the regional level and we do away with local councils—I guess that's the change the member for Downsview is speculating on—then I'm frankly surprised because I thought the NDP and this government supported local government. But if that's what the member's saying, if that's what he wants, he wants to do away with local government, then you're headed in the right direction. Keep it up.

The township of Osgoode has comments with regard to infrastructure. The city of Gloucester: "Although Gloucester recognizes that sewers will have to come under regional control, in the long term the city's real problems are concerns about Ottawa's large infrastructure debt and the possibility that local ratepayers will have to pay higher taxes to the region to pay down the debt."

I guess those are all the issues that I'll have time to comment on today. I just might say, for another minute, reverting back to the issue about the mayors being on the regional council, that there have been suggestions that have come forward and many people have come forward with suggestions as to how the mayors could retain some membership, I guess, on the regional council. Even the minister, to his credit, in November of last year did suggest, and I have an amendment that the minister apparently at that time was proposing to the bill, that 10 of the 11 mayors, with the exception of Rockcliffe, still be on the regional council and that they have half a vote instead of a full vote. I would suggest to go the whole vote, but at least at that point the minister recognized the value of having the mayors on the regional council and suggested that even if it's only a half a vote, at least they be there. So I would hope, during the very limited time that we've got, that the minister would carry forth with that suggestion that he put as a starting point back in November, I believe it was, of last year and build on that and come to something that will accommodate the mayors, because they serve a very practical role.

The mayors themselves have come forward with suggestions. A weighted system is in use in some places in Canada; I believe in Simcoe—

**Mr Murdoch:** Grey county.

**Mr David Johnson:** —Grey county. One of the suggestions would be that the chairman would have 29 votes, the 18 directly elected members—by the way, I'm not against directly elected members; we have that here in Toronto and I'm not against that concept—would have 72 votes and the mayors would have 47 votes and it would be weighted.

**Mr Perruzza:** So what are you for, David?

**Mr David Johnson:** I am for the mayors being on the regional council. I have said that a number of times.

**Mr Murdoch:** You're against that, Tony. Get it right. You are against the mayors.

**Mr Perruzza:** I am not against the mayors.

**Mr Murdoch:** Sure you are.

**Mr David Johnson:** The member for Downsview can't get that concept straight, but there are different alternatives for having the mayors on the regional council so that their input will be there and their liaison capabilities will be there. I hope, during the limited time allowed by this closure, that some of these will be able to be explored and we'll be able to strike a situation that is agreeable and that will work.

The most important thing is that we put in place a structure that will work for the people in the region of Ottawa-Carleton. I have to say that I don't think the bill as it is currently written will do that. I'm sorry to say that I think it will create more problems in the future, so I hope that during this very limited time we can deal with some of these issues.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

1710

**Mr Murdoch:** I appreciate the time that I have to speak on the closure of Bill 143. It never ceases to amaze me how this government can tick me off. You talk on and on over there about democracy, but where is it? If we want to be responsible, there is a specific procedure that we must follow with respect to legislation. I could spell it out to you, but if you don't know how it works now, I'm telling you, we're all in real trouble.

Let me just say it's hard to believe that this government would move for closure on a bill it only introduced a couple of weeks ago. This is a significant issue, significant not only in Ottawa-Carleton but to all the municipalities, politicians and people in this province. What occurred in this House yesterday is nothing short of ridiculous: cutting off debate whenever you feel like it. You do this all the time whenever you've got your backs up against the wall. This is unacceptable.

What is also unacceptable is that here we are today, debating a right to debate. What a waste of time. If we'd received our chance to speak yesterday, none of this would even have had to happen. You've got to stop wasting time and you've got to stop ramming legislation down the public's throats without listening to what they have to say. You're great at consulting but you don't listen; that's your problem over there.

I want to make it unmistakably clear that the people in my riding think this is an awful bill and will not support it. This should matter to you. Obviously, it doesn't.

I receive letters daily from the councils and municipalities in my area that have passed their own resolutions to support the township of West Carleton in opposition to this bill. As a current example, I received this letter today in the mail from Grey county and it reads:

"To the honourable sir, the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

"At the March 30, 1994, session of Grey county council the following resolution was adopted:

"That the county of Grey endorse the resolution from the township of West Carleton regarding Bill 143." A copy of West Carleton's resolution is attached.

"Your attention to this matter is respectfully requested."

There are the people out there asking you to look at something, and I think that the resolution from West Carleton should be read into this House. It says:

"Be it resolved that:

"Whereas the council of the corporation of the township of West Carleton deems it necessary to clearly state its position in the matter of the reform of local government in the region of Ottawa-Carleton; and

"Whereas the Minister of Municipal Affairs refuses to discuss and negotiate alterations"—at that time it was to Bill 77; now we call it Bill 143—"and

"Whereas the Ministry of Municipal Affairs has ignored the recommendations of all its own consultants to leave local municipal mayors on regional council"—this is one of the big things about this—"and

"Whereas the proposed legislation eliminates local mayors from the regional government, thereby depriving the local municipalities from providing input into regional issues"—now that makes sense, but you don't seem to understand this—"and

"Whereas the Minister of Municipal Affairs has ignored studies indicating the increased costs of proposed changes to the structure of local government; and

"Whereas the Minister of Municipal Affairs has refused to amend the proposed legislation despite the fact that the majority of the local municipalities supported certain amendments"—again, "the majority"; that's what's supposed to work around here—"and

"Whereas the Minister of Municipal Affairs does intend to introduce some changes to this legislation but does not intend to provide details of these amendments until after third reading"—and that's typical of this government; after we get third reading you bring in the regulations—"and

"Whereas the Minister of Municipal Affairs has stated that he will not discuss changes with the duly elected representatives and the ratepayers of Ottawa-Carleton,

"Be it resolved that the council hereby requests the Minister of Municipal Affairs not to proceed with this bill; and

"Further, be it resolved that the clerk forward a copy of this motion to all local municipalities in Ottawa-Carleton, requesting the motion be endorsed and forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs."

This resolution was also passed around to a lot of the other municipalities in Ontario, especially in my riding, and I have the town of Thornbury that supports it. There's the town of Thornbury, the township of St Vincent, the village of Markdale, Osprey township, the town of Durham, Euphrasia township; even the city of Owen Sound in my riding supports West Carleton's resolution. I know there are many more from other

municipalities all over Grey county and Ontario. Even AMO doesn't support this, and I can't understand, Mr Minister, why you would want to proceed with this.

If you're going to go ahead and give them some meetings in Ottawa-Carleton, that would be greatly appreciated, because you're going to have to hear, and hopefully, rather than just consult and not listen, you do consult and you do listen and you do bring in some changes.

I see the House leader nodding his head that this is what will happen, but it hasn't happened before, so if it happens this time it'll be short of a miracle because—

**Hon Mr Philip:** It happens all the time.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** It happens.

**Mr Murdoch:** No, it hasn't. The minister over there, Madam Speaker, says it has happened. Well, it would be nice if you had some time to tell me that, because it wouldn't take long for you to tell me. There's not many of them there. I know that there aren't a lot of chances that they've done anything to support us.

Although I'm not from Ottawa-Carleton—as I've said, this particular bill will not directly affect my riding—it is none the less a great concern for both myself and the municipalities in Grey, as I've pointed out. The majority of them have passed resolutions supporting West Carleton.

This bill will only serve to set a bad precedent for the rest of the regional governments and county governments in Ontario. In Grey county they have passed a resolution, and it's been passed in this House, that there is a weighted system. So there's no problem with doing this with the mayors. It's been done, and it can easily be done now.

I just want to point out that this minister hasn't been listening. Obviously, he has a hidden agenda here somewhere.

**Hon Mr Philip:** How many mayors on the county government?

**Mr Murdoch:** There is a hidden agenda. It's unfortunate they have this hidden agenda in nearly every bill they bring in here. As we've said before, when they get their backs up to the wall, then they say: "Hey, we're just going to close on you. We've got the power. We're a socialist government so we want to behave like real socialists, and we're not going to let you debate any longer."

Unfortunately, they're sticking true to their roots. We can say that about them anyway; they are performing like socialists would. When they get in trouble: "Hey, we have the power; we'll just stop you." The only thing they haven't brought is the police force in here to do it, but that will be next. They have done it on some of our other members, like in Mr Elston's office in Bruce county. When they got in trouble there, they sent the police right into his office to search out things.

So this government is behaving like true socialists, which the people of Ontario don't want, and we'll soon find out about that in the next election, what the people think of these people. As we've said, we've already found out in five elections what they think of their



socialist policies, and I'm sure we're going to find out more what's going to happen.

Again, I just want to say that this government on the other side gets A for consulting but fails miserably in listening to people. That is really unfortunate, because there are some good things they could do in this province. Unfortunately, they don't seem to want to do that, and it's just proven by coming up with a motion like this to close debate.

As I mentioned before too, here we are debating why we can't debate. If they had left things alone, we'd have been done with this. But here you had to bring in another motion. You could have actually got on one of your other silly ideas today and maybe debated it for a while. But no, you had to panic and say: "No, we're going to force you to quit. We can go out and tell our members that we have the power, and we can force the opposition when we want them to be quiet."

I'm really sorry this has happened. I hope that the people in Ottawa-Carleton get a chance to express their concerns and that maybe this time the minister—and I appreciate the minister being here today to listen, though. I will put that in, that you are here, because a lot of the times the ministers don't even come in and listen to us. This time I'll say the minister is here, and I certainly appreciate that. I hope that he will listen to the people of Ottawa-Carleton and some of the other members who have told him what they would like to happen up there and that he can change this bill before it's finally passed.

**Mr Norman W. Sterling (Carleton):** I was really quite interested in Mr Murdoch's speech. As a practical former municipal politician, he understands the value of local government and how close local government is to the people. I was interested in how the minister reacted to his talking about county government, and the minister yelled back, "Well, how many mayors sit on county government?"

Everybody knows mayors don't sit on county government; reeves do, and reeves are mayors in terms of municipalities. In effect, that's what they are. In fact, in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, a lot of the municipalities used to have reeves until I brought in a bill which made everybody a mayor so that it would be all the same and nobody would confuse who is a reeve and who is a mayor, because some were reeves and some were mayors and that was the way it was.

Bill 143 is a bill which is trying to restructure the government in Ottawa-Carleton. It emanates out of a number of studies. The first study was the Bartlett commission. The next study—

**Mr Callahan:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order: I don't think the government has maintained a quorum in the House.

1720

**The Acting Speaker:** Could the clerk please determine if a quorum is present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A

quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Carleton may resume.

**Mr Sterling:** This bill emanates out of two reports on the restructuring of Ottawa-Carleton. One was the Bartlett report and the other was the Kirby report, one done in the 1980s under a Liberal government and the Kirby report done under the government of the day.

The Kirby report that came out said that the existing council, which consists of 15 councillors from Ottawa, one mayor from Ottawa and 11 mayors from the surrounding area, plus a number of regional councillors from Nepean and Gloucester, making a total of 32, should be replaced by a regionally directly elected council of 18, plus the chairman, plus 10 of the 11 mayors. Mr Kirby excluded the mayor of Rockcliffe because Rockcliffe is such a small municipality in relation to the others. It's 2,500 people, approximately speaking.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** Madam Speaker, on a point of order: In regard to a time allocation motion such as we're debating today in regard to issues affecting the city of Ottawa, do the opposition Liberal members from those ridings have to be here in order to debate it? I only see two opposition members in the House.

**The Acting Speaker:** There is nothing out of order. The member for Carleton, please resume.

**Mr Sterling:** I was trying to explain to the people who might be watching what this debate is all about and trying to come to a conclusion as to why closure is being introduced today.

Basically, Kirby recommended that the new council be 18 plus one, which is 19, plus 10, making a total of 29 people elected.

What this government did and why it has encouraged the opposition to be somewhat strident in its opposition has been to eliminate the 10 mayors from being included on regional council. When the government talks about consultation, none of the previous consultation which has taken place in Ottawa-Carleton has included this idea of kicking the mayors off regional government.

This has resulted in a number of different kinds of scenarios as a result of this happening. The fact of the matter is that this will be the first regional government in all of Ontario which will not have mayors sitting on regional government.

I was struck this morning, on Thursday, April 7, when we're debating this closure motion, to read in the paper John Barber who is talking about Metro Toronto government. The title of his article is "It's Time to Reinvent Metro Council." I understand Mr Barber follows Metro council and follows municipal politics in the city of Toronto. What he is suggesting in his article is that they do away with Metro council, go back to the idea that Metro council do away with directly elected people and have people appointed to commissions to take care of larger matters like police, like transit, and that the province take over the whole idea of the social welfare system.

I think his article makes a lot of sense. Quite frankly,

if I were part of the next government, I would consider doing away with regional government. This debate has really focused for me the whole debate of Metro and regional government. It has opened my eyes to really maybe how unnecessary regional government or Metro government might be. I am becoming more and more convinced that directly elected Metro councillors, directly elected regional government councillors, is perhaps an unnecessary level of government, a level of government that we can ill afford in this province.

Do you know what is also interesting about this? The reaction of the city council in the city of Ottawa to what is going on. At the present time, there are 15 councillors in the city of Ottawa and they not only sit on the local government council of the city of Ottawa but they sit on regional government as well.

One would have thought that when these directly elected regional councillors are going to be elected what would have resulted would be that there would be a downscaling of the responsibilities of the people at the local level. In other words, the city of Ottawa councillors would become part-time and the regional councillors perhaps would become full-time politicians. Well, surprise, surprise. The fact of the matter is that not only are we going to have full-time regional councillors but we are going to have full-time local councillors in the city of Ottawa.

What does this mean to the taxpayer? It means that Mr Philip and Ms Gigantes are going to basically increase the cost of doing politics in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton by about \$2 million a year. I substantiated those figures in my remarks during the second reading debate on this bill. It's also going to require some \$3 million, \$2.9 million, I believe, to renovate regional headquarters to accommodate these 18 full-time regional councillors.

I just don't think it's necessary. I think that quite frankly what's happened is that we are now making local government a function of regional government, whereas in my view, regional or county government should be a function of local government.

When you look at this whole mess that we're into in Ottawa-Carleton, one of the problems that people face when the suggestion of amalgamation comes up, and I've talked to a few of the councillors both in the city of Ottawa—incidentally, the support for this bill is in no way unanimous. In fact, I know two councillors in the city of Ottawa who oppose Bill 143, who are against it because they see this—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Sterling:** There's one councillor in Kanata who was a former NDP candidate against me, Alex Munter, who has, I believe—I haven't heard one other person who is in support—

**Interjection:** He was Evelyn Gigantes's former assistant.

**Mr Sterling:** Yes, he was the former assistant to the Minister of Housing. I expect nothing less in loyalty from Mr Munter in terms—and he wants to run for regional council. He wants to be a full-time politician down at the

region. I would guess that Mr Munter will not be the next regional councillor from Kanata because the overwhelming sentiment for this bill, I can tell you, is not found in the city of Kanata nor is it found in any of the other four townships that I represent.

Because I'm the only Progressive Conservative MPP from the Ottawa-Carleton area, last September I commissioned a poll to find out whether or not what I was hearing from my own constituents, and I represent five of the 11 municipalities, was in fact what the rest of the people in Ottawa-Carleton understood.

1730

What I found out from that poll was it depends on what question you ask and how you ask the question in terms of the response you get back. Were people in favour of restructuring regional government? Yes, they were. We've been hearing nothing but: Through the Kirby report, through the Bartlett report, we've heard about restructuring of government. So some 70% of the respondents said, "Yes, we're in favour of restructuring." But they were also asked whether or not they wanted to have local mayors sit on regional council, and 79% of them said the local mayors should be on regional council, when asked the question.

I also want to indicate that very, very few people understand the ramifications of the bill, because it's complicated and a lot of people don't understand regional government. They do understand local government.

At any rate, I pointed that out before, that the overwhelming number of people in Ottawa-Carleton—not only in the riding of Carleton, which I represent, but right across, including the city of Ottawa—believe the local mayors should be on regional council. If the minister would be so kind as to take his own poll, he would find that as well, because this was independently done and was done, I believe, in a sample of about 400 people. I wanted to do that because when I stood and talked in this Legislature, I didn't want to only represent the people of Carleton; I did want a feeling for what other people were saying in other parts of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Now, we also face some problems in terms of what's going to happen with costs. This is the part that I can't understand about the former NDP candidate who ran against me in the last provincial election in 1990, Mr Munter, who was a councillor and also, quite frankly, is the chairman of the Kanata police services board, which is going to be abolished by this legislation. Mr Munter knows well that this legislation is going to mean an increase in costs and less control in terms of where the police are and what the police do for the city of Kanata, and in my view is acting against the interests of his constituents and the Katimivik part of the city of Kanata. He's free to do that and he'll have to explain that when he comes up and runs for regional council. He's an able politician, he can speak well and he can write well, but I do feel that he's dead wrong on the side of this particular issue. We'll see how that flushes out in the future.

But I guess what I'm most concerned about is that the minister's officials have told me they are not going to provide the city of Kanata with one cent of transition



funds when it's going to be faced with larger regional police tax bills. The cost is going to go from somewhere around \$3.1 million for the city of Kanata to somewhere around \$5.2 to \$5.7 million per year, depending on the basis of the assumptions you make when you put those figures forward.

The minister has said that for the townships of West Carleton, Goulbourn, Rideau, Osgoode and Cumberland there is going to be some transition funding, but he has not said how much, how long etc. In the first instance, he said that this funding was going to have to come from the goodwill of regional council. I believe he's now changed his position and is saying that the province is going to put up money for that transitional period, and I hold him to that. If he doesn't agree with that particular position, I would hope that he would clarify it so that we know what we're going to debate when we go back down to the city of Ottawa and talk about this bill.

This bill not only has implications for Ottawa-Carleton but for all of Ontario. As my friend from Grey-Owen Sound indicated, this bill has a lot of implications for regional government in the future; it has a lot of implications for county government in the future.

Now, my feeling is, and I think polls have proven, that local government is far, far more popular than regional government and far, far more popular and trusted than our own Legislature or our own provincial governments.

**Mr Bisson:** It's because of the members.

**Mr Sterling:** Well, maybe because of the members. I know it's not that way down in Carleton, but it is perhaps up in Cochrane South, where the member Mr Bisson just said it was because of the members. Maybe that's true up there; I don't know. I don't know that area very well. I would try not to speak to that.

I also wanted to say I was somewhat surprised that the government brought in this motion on the one hand, because yesterday when we were speaking, I had an opportunity to speak on second reading, Mr Johnson had an opportunity to speak, and the member for Grey-Owen Sound spoke very briefly, but we actually let our turn go, I believe, on one or two occasions in order to allow—

**Mr Bisson:** One occasion.

**Mr Sterling:** Well, we got to the end of our three speakers after that. We wanted to allow the members from the Liberal caucus who were MPPs from that area to have an opportunity to speak on second debate. The member for Ottawa South was not given that opportunity to have his 30 minutes to speak on this bill. In fact, I think he got about five minutes speaking on this bill. We wouldn't have even been involved in this debate to this point in time—in fact, we could have finished second reading debate earlier this afternoon and moved on to other business, because we were finished as far as that goes.

In the past, we had indicated to the minister that we were going to be strident and obstreperous in dealing with this bill. That of course is part of the strategy of opposition, to discourage the government. That's part of the game. But once the government House leader had given the minister some legislative time, it was obvious

to me that the government was going to put this bill through. The government can pass anything it wants with the present standing orders and with its majority. It doesn't matter what Norm Sterling or anybody else does; we don't have the right any longer, as you know, to filibuster a bill. That's not allowed by our standing orders, which were changed by this government.

I was quite flattered, frankly, when the press would come to me and say, "Sterling, you're stopping this bill." I'd say, "Jeez, you know, I didn't realize I was that powerful." They were saying at the end of December that I had stopped this bill; somehow I had stopped this bill dead in its tracks. I said, "Wait a minute. I don't believe for a second that this bill is stopped," notwithstanding what Ms Gigantes or Mr Philip had said at that time. They said the bill had been stopped. Mr Minister, you said that if we didn't have this by the end of December, we were done. I didn't debate for one minute on this bill to stop it and I was really amazed with the influence I have in terms of putting forward the agenda of the government. I didn't have to say one word. I was amazed. I just wish I was able to sustain that kind of strength and that kind of influence in the future in putting forward the agenda of this government.

The fact of the matter is that this government could have had this bill, and now, because they have in fact put forward this amount of legislative time—they should have called this bill in October or November of last year. They should really have done it at that time and then we would have the proper amount of time to go down into Ottawa and to consult with the people. We are, I understand, members from the Ottawa area, both myself and members from the Liberal caucus, going to have hearings on Friday and Saturday of not this weekend but next weekend and the following weekend. Those hearings may or may not offer all of the people in the area an opportunity to speak on the bill, but they will offer some of the people an opportunity to speak on the bill.

The real problem we face here now, though, is that Bill 143 was only introduced about a week ago and it put another hitch into it and it included the creation of the French Catholic board and the French public board from the amalgamated board. My only concern with regard to adding that wrinkle to Bill 77, which Bill 143 superseded, is that the people who were concerned with that issue wouldn't have the proper time to get the bill into their hands, talk to each other, consult with each other and bring forward their amendments to that bill or suggestions as to how this thing's going to be cut out.

1740

I don't expect there will be a great deal of debate on it. I think the trustees of both boards, or both sections of the amalgamated board now, are in favour of that, but we haven't heard from the person on the street, the parents of the some 18,000 students who receive their education under this amalgamated French board which we have in the Ottawa-Carleton area.

One of my constituents wrote to me, and I received his letter this morning. He said he was absolutely amazed at the incompetence of this government as to how this whole fiasco has occurred.

**Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East):** Can I get a copy of that?

**Mr Sterling:** Yes, I can give the member for Ottawa East a copy of that. In fact, we should probably print it and distribute it not only to your constituency but the constituency of Ottawa Centre as well.

He's absolutely amazed at how this legislation has been brought forward, how the government can go ahead and pretend that consultation has taken place on this when in fact it changed the rules of the game halfway through. They didn't follow Kirby; they introduced a whole new concept. They have failed to put on the table what kind of financial support they're going to give to the people who are involved in this whole thing.

It really is amazing to have a constituent who has been following this—I don't know which party he's a member of, but he's absolutely amazed and quite shaken, actually, by the fact that legislation can be formed this way and that a government can act this way and pretend it's gone through consultation. It really is kind of odd to receive from somebody who has watched legislation and watched how incompetent this government has been on bringing forward this proposal—I'm sorry the government has seen fit to move closure on this, but I think that in terms of what this particular constituent has said to me, the moving of closure today does sort of seal the case on the fact that the government has been totally inept in handling this legislation and bringing it before the Legislature. We were quite willing to end debate today. We were quite willing to give the member for Ottawa South his opportunity to speak on this matter, yet the government brings forward this useless closure motion in order to end debate.

The other part that's kind of amazing is that the minister has continued to set dates. We had to have this legislation by December 31 or it was off; it was finished. There's no way we could have new regional restructured government, and Evelyn Gigantes stood there at an Ottawa press conference and said, "Those opposition guys are going to scupper it if they don't give it to us by the end of December." There was a demand that we deal with this bill in one hour.

It doesn't matter that there's seven members from the Legislature. Taking out the minister would have left us approximately seven minutes each to speak on it. I think the arithmetic comes out to about that: seven minutes each. Thanks very much, Mr Philip. Thanks very much for all the chance to speak about my concerns that I have, how you're jacking up the property taxes on the people in my constituency, taking control away from my people in terms of the kind of policing they have in the city of Kanata, taking away perhaps in the near future, as I suspect, a very satisfactory OPP policing arrangement which has been arranged by the city of Kanata.

Then, I don't know what happened, but some time in January all of a sudden they forgot about December 31, 1993, and they decided—and do you know what? When they were saying this thing, that it had to be finished on December 31, 1993, I said to the papers: "I don't believe it. I don't think, quite frankly, that they have to finish this legislation by December 31, 1993." And you know,

the press kept saying, "Yes, but Mr Philip says that it's got to be finished by December 19 or we can't have a restructured government in Ottawa-Carleton."

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** What happened?

**Mr Sterling:** I don't know what happened, but somewhere between then and February 7 when Mr Philip then wrote to everybody in Ottawa-Carleton that he was indeed going to pass this legislation, he said, "Regrettably, Bill 77 was not passed by the Legislature prior to January 1, 1994." "Regrettably"? You didn't even call it for second reading. How can you pass a piece of legislation if you don't call it? Give me a break.

It's also interesting to note in the same article, I think you're aware of this article; you might have seen it once before. But the minister said, "The bill will be law well in advance of the official closing date for nominations of October 14, 1994." But why are we debating it? If by fiat the minister can declare something by law, we don't need any votes in this Legislature; we don't need debate; we don't need public hearings. The minister has the right to legislate, to declare it's done, it's finished.

The member for Nepean raised this issue and quite frankly, I read this letter to the Ottawa electors and potential candidates, and it struck me funny as well. I thought about raising it in the Legislature, but I'm glad that the member for Nepean did.

What struck me funny was that in a letter paid for by the government, the minister would say, for instance, "I am calling on the opposition members of the Legislature to cooperate in seeing that this legislation is implemented."

Who is the government? Don't they have a majority? Can't they bring in the legislation? Can't they call the legislation? I just found it a strange kind of letter. I've just never seen anything like this before. Our government took out an ad and I've got to tell you, this ad—that's a full page, or not a full page, it's better than a half-page, probably two thirds of a page. I think you've got to pay, I don't know, \$3,000 or \$4,000 for that kind of thing.

I don't know what this accomplished. I know one thing it accomplished because one of the things—

**Hon Mr Philip:** Twelve thousand.

**Mr Stockwell:** Twelve thousand? That's what that ad cost, \$12,000?

**Hon Mr Philip:** No, all of them.

**Mr Sterling:** Twelve thousand, the minister says. Well, that makes it even worse, Mr Minister.

I've been here 16 years and I have been a minister in the government; I have been here in opposition as the official opposition, and now I'm in the third party. I have never heard a Speaker say to a minister, "You come very close to contempt." Now, I don't think you came close to contempt; I think you might have been in contempt. But I'll tell you why you probably weren't called in contempt, because that would have been a very, very serious matter. In fact, you would have been called before the bar of this House and the House would have had to vote on whether or not you should be excluded from this Legislature. I don't blame the Speaker for not going to that



extent, because that is a very, very serious matter. I don't know if it's ever happened in the Parliament of Ontario.

But I don't think the press or the government have understood the importance of your words in this ruling, how close this minister came to coming in front of the bar of this House and a vote having to be taken to exclude him, and we would have, presumably, a by-election in his riding.

1750

That's a very, very serious charge, and I think when you read this article, when you trace the steps of this minister and his minister in Ottawa Centre, Ms Gigantes, I hope that people will understand how frustrated the opposition is with regard to this minister and her lack of fairness in dealing with issues in Ottawa-Carleton.

The condescending attitude and remarks of Evelyn Gigantes when she was speaking in the Legislature the other day were something to behold, as far as I was concerned. She took statements and moulded them, misinterpreted them, twisted them to such a degree as really challenges credulity.

Mr Speaker, I want to tell you that this minister and his cabinet friend from Ottawa Centre have really not acted fairly with the members of this Legislature who represent that area. They have not acted fairly with the mayors of that area, in terms of bringing forward this surprise move of taking them off regional council, which was not put forward by any of the commission studies that they had.

I am disappointed. I'm really disappointed. At first, I would've supported a lot of the parts of the bill, Bill 77, but they really have handled this in a poor manner. They've shown their incompetence. They've shown arrogance in terms of how they've dealt with this bill, and who knows what'll happen in the next election? The member for Ottawa Centre, she's won, she's lost, she's won, she's lost, she's won, she's lost. I don't know what'll happen.

**Mr Bradley:** The loss is coming up.

**Mr Sterling:** Is it a loss the next time? We'll see. I don't know. The people of Ottawa-Carleton will have to state their opinion at that time.

All I want to say is that I've been fortunate enough to be re-elected five times. I think I know how to read what my constituents are saying to me and I'll tell you that my constituents are saying: "This is a bad law. This is bad restructuring of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton."

I urge the members of the New Democratic Party to not support closure on this bill, notwithstanding the fact that there may be no more debate on second reading, but it would leave some flexibility in the process in the future.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I thank the honourable member for Carleton East for his comments.

**Mr Stockwell:** We don't get two minutes or any other—but with the short time left, I would like to say that this was one of the finer statements this House has seen with respect to legislation that's come forward, and I applaud the member for Carleton.

**The Speaker:** Further debate?

**Hon Mr Philip:** I'd like, in the five minutes that has been allocated to me, to deal with a couple of issues. The member for Nepean, Mr Daigeler, has argued that dealing with the Ottawa-Carleton bill in this way is somehow undemocratic because more time is needed to deal with the bill.

He and the member for Carleton and others could've had this matter dealt with before Christmas, but he and the House leader of the Conservative Party argued that they would in fact filibuster every bill the government had if this bill were called. That's their belief in the democratic system. "If you call a bill, we'll filibuster all of your other bills."

Now they argue that there isn't enough time for the debate. That's sheer sophistry on the part of the two opposition parties because they know what they did to try and sabotage the democratic process of the government before Christmas.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The minister knows better.

**Hon Mr Philip:** The member for Nepean in his press release calls this bill an abandonment of democracy. What could be a greater abomination of the democratic process than the present old system that he's arguing in favour of? What is more democratic now than having a democratic election in Ottawa-Carleton?

The fact is, and the Minister of Revenue will tell you this, that in order to have time for municipal elections in 1994, the Ministry of Finance staff have indicated that in order to fulfil their election responsibilities, legislation has to be in place by May 1, 1994.

In view of the delays in implementing legislation for Ottawa-Carleton, key dates for the election process have already been missed. For example, the candidates for office may register as of January 1, 1994. The new regional candidates may not register until Bill 143 has received royal assent.

The Ministry of Finance cannot complete its work until the new regional and local ward boundaries are in place. That's a fact, Mr Speaker, and the fact that they are trying to filibuster this bill clearly indicates—the member for Nepean said that he would do everything possible to see that this bill never passed. That in fact is the case and that is why this time allocation motion is needed. We need to get this bill through by May 1 in order to ensure that there can be a democratic election in Ottawa-Carleton.

The member for Nepean in his press release calls this bill an abomination of democracy. What could be a greater abomination of democracy than the status quo system that presently exists in Ottawa-Carleton? A system that allows a mayor with an 18,000 electorate or less, and there are about six of those, to have the same vote as a mayor that has about 450,000: That is not representation by population.

**Mr Stockwell:** Have you ever heard of Metro council, Ed? The same vote as the mayors of Toronto.

**The Speaker:** Order, the member for Etobicoke West.

**Hon Mr Philip:** I understand why the Conservatives always defend the status quo, but the system of democracy that they are defending says that it's okay if you're living in one municipality to get absolutely free policing while in the next municipality you can pay for that policing. That's the argument that they are making.

No other part of any other region anywhere in Ontario does not have a regional police force. Every other region in Ontario has a regional police force, and everyone living in every region in Ontario has a regional police force which they pay for. Not only is the present system unfair to the taxpayers of a majority of people in Ottawa-Carleton; it's unfair to the other taxpayers in Ontario when we have this kind of unjust taxation system.

The members of the opposition have used the word "draconian" so many times I can't count them. Well, I understand they have a very limited vocabulary, some of them.

We have used time allocation 13 times since coming into power. This contrasts to 48 times of the last government in the House of Commons under the Conservatives and 29 times in the last time of the House of Commons under the Conservatives again.

I say to the member for Ottawa-Carleton: I don't need any sermons on democracy from him and from that party.

**The Speaker:** Mr Charlton has moved government notice of motion number 24, a resolution which stands in his name. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members; up to a 15-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1759 to 1809.*

**The Speaker:** Mr Charlton has moved government notice of motion number 24, a resolution which stands in his name.

All those in favour of Mr Charlton's resolution will please rise one by one.

**Ayes**

Akande, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Cooper, Duignan, Ferguson,

Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), Lankin, Laughren, Mackenzie, Mammoliti, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Murdock (Sudbury), O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip (Etobicoke-Rexdale), Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

**The Speaker:** All those opposed to Mr Charlton's resolution will please rise one by one.

**Nays**

Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Cousens, Curling, Daigeler, Grandmaitre, Harnick, Johnson (Don Mills), Mahoney, Morin, Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound), O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau), Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt), Sorbara, Sterling, Stockwell, Turnbull, Wilson (Simcoe West).

**The Speaker:** The ayes being 51 and the nays 19, I declare the motion carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Pursuant to standing order 55, I wish to indicate the business of the House for the coming week.

On Monday, April 11, we will give second reading consideration to Bill 138, the retail sales tax act.

On Tuesday, April 12, we will give second reading consideration to Bill 113, the liquor control act, and committee of the whole consideration to Bill 119, the Tobacco Control Act.

On Wednesday, April 13, we will give second reading consideration to Bill 110, the employer health tax act.

On the morning of Thursday, April 14, during the time reserved for private members' public business, we will consider ballot item number 47, second reading of Bill 93, standing in the name of Mr Offer, and ballot item number 48, a resolution standing in the name of Mr Arnott. On Thursday afternoon, we will give second reading consideration to Bill 146, the corporations tax act.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** It being 6 of the clock, this house stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock Monday next.

The House adjourned at 1814.

## ERRATUM

| No. | Page | Column | Line | Should read:  |
|-----|------|--------|------|---|
| 108 | 5424 | 1      | 18   | to designate its own wards. That's another major reason |



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO  
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor/Lieutenant-gouverneur: Lt Col The Hon/L'hon Henry N.R. Jackman CM, KStJ, BA, LLB, LLD  
Speaker/Président: Hon/L'hon David Warner  
Clerk/Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers  
Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals/Greffier adjoint principal et Greffier des journaux: Alex D. McFedries  
Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees/Greffière adjointe et Greffière des comités: Deborah Deller  
Sergeant at Arms/Sergent d'armes: Thomas Stelling

| Constituency<br>Circonscription | Member/Party<br>Député(e) / Parti  | Constituency<br>Circonscription                 | Member/Party<br>Député(e) / Parti   |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Algoma                          | <b>Wildman, Hon/L'hon Bud</b> (ND) Minister of Environment and Energy, minister responsible for native affairs / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones                            | Grey-Owen Sound                                 | Murdoch, Bill (PC)  |
| Algoma-Manitoulin               | Brown, Michael A. (L)  | Guelph  | Fletcher, Derek (ND)  |
| Beaches-Woodbine                | <b>Lankin, Hon/L'hon Frances</b> (ND) Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce   | Halton Centre/-Centre                           | Sullivan, Barbara (L)   |
| Brampton North/-Nord            | McClelland, Carman (L)   | Halton North/-Nord                              | Duignan, Noel (ND)  |
| Brampton South/-Sud             | Callahan, Robert V. (L)  | Hamilton Centre/-Centre                         | <b>Christopherson, Hon/L'hon David</b> (ND) Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels   |
| Brant-Haldimand                 | Eddy, Ron (L)  | Hamilton East/-Est                              | <b>Mackenzie, Hon/L'hon Bob</b> (ND) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail   |
| Brantford                       | <b>Ward, Hon/L'hon Brad</b> (ND) Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Finance / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Finances  | Hamilton Mountain                               | <b>Charlton, Hon/L'hon Brian A.</b> (ND) Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House leader and minister responsible for the automobile insurance review / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire du gouvernement et ministre délégué à l'Assurance-automobile  |
| Bruce                           | Elston, Murray J. (L)  |   | <b>Allen, Hon/L'hon Richard</b> (ND) Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère du Développement économique et du Commerce  |
| Burlington South/-Sud           | Jackson, Cameron (PC)  | Hamilton West/-Ouest                            | <b>Buchanan, Hon/L'hon Elmer</b> (ND) Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales  |
| Cambridge                       | <b>Farnan, Hon/L'hon Mike</b> (ND) Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Education and Training / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de l'Éducation et de la Formation  | Hastings-Peterborough                           | <b>Ziemba, Hon/L'hon Elaine</b> (ND) Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for human rights, disability issues, seniors' issues and race relations / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre déléguée aux Droits de la personne, aux Affaires des personnes handicapées, aux Affaires des personnes âgées et aux Relations interraciales |
| Carleton                        | Sterling, Norman W. (PC)   | High Park-Swansea                               | <b>Klopp, Paul</b> (ND)   |
| Carleton East/-Est              | Morin, Gilles E. (L)   | Huron   | McClash, Frank (L)  |
| Chatham-Kent                    | Hope, Randy R. (ND)  | Kenora  | Wilson, Gary (ND)   |
| Cochrane North/-Nord            | Wood, Len (ND)   | Kingston and The Islands / Kingston et Les îles |   |
| Cochrane South/-Sud             | Bisson, Gilles (ND)  | Kitchener                                       | Ferguson, Will (Ind)  |
| Cornwall                        | Cleary, John C. (L)  | Kitchener-Wilmot                                | Cooper, Mike (ND)   |
| Don Mills                       | Johnson, David (PC)  | Lake Nipigon/Lac-Nipigon                        | <b>Pouliot, Hon/L'hon Gilles</b> (ND) Minister of Transportation, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Transports, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones  |
| Dovercourt                      | <b>Silipo, Hon/L'hon Tony</b> (ND) Minister of Community and Social Services / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires   |   | MacKinnon, Ellen (ND)   |
| Downsview                       | Perruzza, Anthony (ND)   | Lambton   | Jordan, Leo (PC)  |
| Dufferin-Peel                   | Tilson, David (PC)   | Lanark-Renfrew                                  | Cordiano, Joseph (L)  |
| Durham Centre/-Centre           | White, Drummond (ND)   | Lawrence  | Runciman, Robert W. (PC)  |
| Durham East/-Est                | Mills, Gordon (ND)   | Leeds-Grenville                                 | Hansen, Ron (ND)  |
| Durham West/-Ouest              | Wiseman, Jim (ND)  | Lincoln   | <b>Boyd, Hon/L'hon Marion</b> (ND) Attorney General, minister responsible for women's issues / procureure générale, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine   |
| Durham-York                     | O'Connor, Larry (ND)   | London Centre/-Centre                           | Cunningham, Dianne (PC)   |
| Eglinton                        | Poole, Dianne (L)  | London North/-Nord                              | Winninger, David (ND)   |
| Elgin                           | North, Peter (Ind)   | London South/-Sud                               | Cousens, W. Donald (PC)   |
| Essex-Kent                      | Hayes, Pat (ND)  | Markham   | Mathysen, Irene (ND)  |
| Essex South/-Sud                | Crozier, Bruce (L)   | Middlesex                                       | Sola, John (Ind)  |
| Etobicoke-Humber                | Henderson, D. James (L)  | Mississauga East/-Est                           | Offer, Steven (L)   |
| Etobicoke-Lakeshore             | <b>Grier, Hon/L'hon Ruth</b> (ND) Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé  | Mississauga North/-Nord                         | Marland, Margaret (PC)  |
| Etobicoke-Rexdale               | <b>Philip, Hon/L'hon Ed</b> (ND) Minister of Municipal Affairs, minister responsible for the office for the greater Toronto area / ministre des Affaires municipales, ministre responsable du Bureau de la région du grand Toronto | Mississauga South/-Sud                          |   |
| Etobicoke West/-Ouest           | Stockwell, Chris (PC)  |   |   |
| Fort William                    | McLeod, Lyn (L) Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition  |   |   |
| Fort York                       | Marchese, Rosario (ND)   |   |   |
| Frontenac-Addington             | <b>Wilson, Hon/L'hon Fred</b> (ND) Minister without Portfolio and chief government whip / ministre sans portefeuille et whip en chef du gouvernement   |   |   |

| Constituency<br>Circonscription                                       | Member/Party<br>Député(e) / Parti   | Constituency<br>Circonscription      | Member/Party<br>Député(e) / Parti   |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| Mississauga West/-Ouest   | Mahoney, Steven W. (L)  | St Andrew-St Patrick                 | Akande, Zanana L. (ND)  |
| Muskoka-Georgian Bay  | Waters, Daniel (ND)   | St Catharines                        | Bradley, James J. (L)   |
| Nepean  | Daigeler, Hans (L)  | St Catharines-Brock                  | Haeck, Christel (ND)  |
| Niagara Falls   | Harrington, Margaret H. (ND)  | St George-St David                   | Murphy, Tim (L)   |
| Niagara South/-Sud  | <b>Coppen, Hon/L'hon Shirley</b> (ND) Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs | Sarnia                               | Huget, Bob (ND)   |
| Nickel Belt   | <b>Laughren, Hon/L'hon Floyd</b> (ND) Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances  | Sault Ste Marie / Sault-Sainte-Marie | Martin, Tony (ND)   |
| Nipissing   | Harris, Michael D. (PC)   | Scarborough-Agincourt                | Phillips, Gerry (L)   |
| Norfolk   | Jamison, Norm (ND)  | Scarborough Centre/-Centre           | Owens, Stephen (ND)   |
| Northumberland  | Fawcett, Joan M. (L)  | Scarborough East/-Est                | Frankford, Robert (ND)  |
| Oakville South/-Sud   | Carr, Gary (PC)   | Scarborough-Ellesmere                | <b>Warner, Hon/L'hon David</b> (ND) Speaker / Président   |
| Oakwood   | Rizzo, Tony (ND)  | Scarborough North/-Nord              | Curling, Alvin (L)  |
| Oriole  | Caplan, Elinor (L)  | Scarborough West/-Ouest              | <b>Swarbrick, Hon/L'hon Anne</b> (ND) Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation / ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et des Loisirs  |
| Oshawa  | <b>Pilkey, Hon/L'hon Allan</b> (ND) Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Municipal Affairs / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère des Affaires municipales                                  | Simcoe Centre/-Centre                | Wessenger, Paul (ND)  |
| Ottawa Centre/-Centre   | <b>Gigantes, Hon/L'hon Evelyn</b> (ND) Minister of Housing / ministre du Logement   | Simcoe East/-Est                     | McLean, Allan K. (PC)   |
| Ottawa East/-Est  | Grandmaitre, Bernard (L)  | Simcoe West/-Ouest                   | Wilson, Jim (PC)  |
| Ottawa-Rideau   | O'Neill, Yvonne (L)   | Sudbury                              | Murdock, Sharon (ND)  |
| Ottawa South/-Sud   | McGuinty, Dalton (L)  | Sudbury East/-Est                    | <b>Martel, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b> (ND) Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines   |
| Ottawa West/-Ouest  | Chiarelli, Robert (L)   | Timiskaming                          | Ramsay, David (L)   |
| Oxford  | Sutherland, Kimble (ND)   | Victoria-Haliburton                  | Hodgson, Chris (PC)   |
| Parkdale  | Ruprecht, Tony (L)  | Waterloo North/-Nord                 | Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)  |
| Parry Sound   | Eves, Ernie L. (PC)   | Welland-Thorold                      | Kormos, Peter (ND)  |
| Perth   | Haslam, Karen (ND)  | Wellington                           | Arnott, Ted (PC)  |
| Peterborough  | Carter, Jenny (ND)  | Wentworth East/-Est                  | Morrow, Mark (ND)   |
| Port Arthur   | <b>Wark-Martyn, Hon/L'hon Shelley</b> (ND) Minister without Portfolio, Ministry of Health / ministre sans portefeuille, ministère de la Santé   | Wentworth North/-Nord                | Abel, Donald (ND)   |
| Prescott and Russell / Prescott et Russell                            | Poirier, Jean (L)   | Willowdale                           | Harnick, Charles (PC)   |
| Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings/Prince Edward-Lennox-Hastings-Sud | Johnson, Paul R. (ND)   | Wilson Heights                       | Kwinter, Monte (L)  |
| Quinte  | O'Neil, Hugh (L)  | Windsor-Riverside                    | <b>Cooke, Hon/L'hon David S.</b> (ND) Minister of Education and Training, minister responsible for the Ontario Training and Adjustment Board / ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation, ministre responsable du Conseil ontarien de formation et d'adaptation de la main-d'œuvre |
| Rainy River   | <b>Hampton, Hon/L'hon Howard</b> (ND) Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles   | Windsor-Sandwich                     | Dadamo, George (ND)   |
| Renfrew North/-Nord   | Conway, Sean G. (L)   | Windsor-Walkerville                  | Lessard, Wayne (ND)   |
| Riverdale   | <b>Churley, Hon/L'hon Marilyn</b> (ND) Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce   | York Centre/-Centre                  | Sorbara, Gregory S. (L)   |
| S-D-G & East Grenville / S-D-G et Grenville-Est                       | Villeneuve, Noble (PC)  | York East/-Est                       | Malkowski, Gary (ND)  |
|   |   | York Mills                           | Turnbull, David (PC)  |
|   |   | York-Mackenzie                       | Beer, Charles (L)   |
|   |   | York South/-Sud                      | <b>Rae, Hon/L'hon Bob</b> (ND) Premier, President of the Executive Council, Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs / premier ministre, président du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires gouvernementales  |
|   |   | Yorkview                             | Mammoliti, George (ND)  |



**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Administration of justice/Administration de la justice**

Chair/Président: Rosario Marchese  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Margaret H. Harrington  
Zanana L. Akande, Gilles Bisson, Robert Chiarelli,  
Alvin Curling, Christel Haec, Charles Harnick,  
Gary Malkowski, Tim Murphy, David Tilson,  
David Winninger  
Clerk/Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Estimates/Budgets des dépenses**

Chair/Président: Cameron Jackson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ted Arnott  
Donald Abel, Gary Carr, Noel Duignan, Murray J. Elston,  
Derek Fletcher, Pat Hayes, Wayne Lessard,  
Steven W. Mahoney, David Ramsay, Jim Wiseman  
Clerk/Greffier: Tonia Grannum

**Finance and economic affairs/  
Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair/Président: Paul R. Johnson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Jim Wiseman  
Elinor Caplan, Gary Carr, W. Donald Cousens,  
Karen Haslam, Norm Jamison, Monte Kwinter,  
Wayne Lessard, Irene Mathyssen, Gerry Phillips,  
Kimble Sutherland  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**General government/Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair/Président: Michael A. Brown  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Hans Daigeler  
Ted Arnott, George Dadamo, Bernard Grandmaître,  
David Johnson, George Mammoliti, Gordon Mills,  
Mark Morrow, Gregory S. Sorbara, Paul Wessinger,  
Drummond White  
Clerk/Greffier: Franco Carrozza

**Government agencies/Organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair/Présidente: Margaret Marland  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Allan K. McLean  
James J. Bradley, Jenny Carter, John C. Cleary,  
Alvin Curling, Robert Frankford, Margaret H. Harrington,  
Gary Malkowski, George Mammoliti, Daniel Waters,  
Elizabeth Witmer  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**Legislative Assembly/Assemblée législative**

Chair/Président: Ron Hansen  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Paul Wessinger  
George Dadamo, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon,  
Irene Mathyssen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin,  
Norman W. Sterling, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland,  
Noble Villeneuve  
Clerk/Greffière: Lisa Freedman

**Ombudsman**

Chair/Président: Tony Rizzo  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Gary Wilson  
Donald Abel, Zanana L. Akande, Mike Cooper,  
Karen Haslam, D. James Henderson, Tony Martin,  
Frank Miclash, Bill Murdoch, David Ramsay,  
Chris Stockwell  
Clerk/Greffier: Todd Decker

**Public accounts/Comptes publics**

Chair/Président: Joseph Cordiano  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Dianne Poole  
Gilles Bisson, Robert V. Callahan, Bruce Crozier,  
Robert Frankford, Rosario Marchese, Margaret Marland,  
Larry O'Connor, Stephen Owens, Anthony Perruzza,  
David Tilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Todd Decker

**Regulations and private bills/  
Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair/Présidente: Christel Haec  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Ellen MacKinnon  
Ron Eddy, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Pat Hayes,  
David Johnson, Leo Jordan, Gordon Mills, Hugh O'Neil,  
Anthony Perruzza, Tony Ruprecht  
Clerk/Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Resources development/Développement des  
ressources**

Chair/Président: Bob Huget  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Mike Cooper  
Sean G. Conway, Joan M. Fawcett, Leo Jordan, Paul  
Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Turnbull,  
Daniel Waters, Gary Wilson, Len Wood  
Clerk/Greffière: Tannis Manikel

**Social development/Affaires sociales**

Chair/Président: Charles Beer  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ron Eddy  
Jenny Carter, Dianne Cunningham, Randy R. Hope,  
Tony Martin, Dalton McGuinty, Larry O'Connor,  
Yvonne O'Neill, Stephen Owens, Tony Rizzo, Jim Wilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Douglas Arnott

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month.

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et le premier lundi de chaque mois.





## CONTENTS

Thursday 7 April 1994

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Social Assistance Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 144,</b> |            |
| <i>Mr Carr</i> , second reading                                     |            |
| Mr Carr   | 5435, 5443 |
| Mr Huget  | 5436       |
| Mr Bradley  | 5437       |
| Mr McLean   | 5438       |
| Mr Sutherland   | 5439       |
| Mrs O'Neill   | 5439       |
| Mr Arnott   | 5440       |
| Mr Hope   | 5441       |
| Mr Grandmaitre  | 5441       |
| Mr Jackson  | 5442       |
| Negated   | 5450       |
| <b>Avian Emblem Act, 1994, Bill 147,</b>                            |            |
| <i>Ms Murdock</i> , second reading                                  |            |
| Ms Murdock  | 5443, 5450 |
| Mr Curling  | 5444       |
| Mr Jordan   | 5445       |
| Mr Wood   | 5446       |
| Mr McLean   | 5447       |
| Mrs Mathysen  | 5448       |
| Mrs Witmer  | 5449       |
| Mr Laughren   | 5449       |
| Mr Brown  | 5449       |
| Mr Bradley  | 5450       |
| Agreed to   | 5451       |

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Bloorview Children's Hospital</b>   |      |
| Mrs Caplan                             | 5451 |
| <b>Transportation for the disabled</b> |      |
| Mr David Johnson                       | 5451 |
| <b>Tiina Côté</b>                      |      |
| Mr Hansen                              | 5451 |
| <b>Police services</b>                 |      |
| Mr Murphy                              | 5452 |
| <b>Education financing</b>             |      |
| Mr McLean                              | 5452 |
| <b>Elections in South Africa</b>       |      |
| Ms Carter                              | 5452 |
| <b>Nuclear safety</b>                  |      |
| Mr Crozier                             | 5452 |

|                                   |      |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| <b>TVOntario teachers' awards</b> |      |
| Mrs Witmer                        | 5453 |
| <b>Highway safety</b>             |      |
| Mr Abel                           | 5453 |

### ORAL QUESTIONS

|                                       |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Public safety</b>                  |            |
| Mrs McLeod                            | 5455       |
| Mr Christopherson                     | 5455       |
| <b>Fire safety</b>                    |            |
| Mrs McLeod                            | 5456       |
| Ms Gigantes                           | 5456       |
| <b>HIV in correctional facilities</b> |            |
| Mr Runciman                           | 5457       |
| Mr Christopherson                     | 5457       |
| <b>Health care</b>                    |            |
| Mr Jim Wilson                         | 5458       |
| Mrs Grier                             | 5458       |
| <b>Non-profit housing</b>             |            |
| Mr Cordiano                           | 5459       |
| Ms Gigantes                           | 5459, 5460 |
| Mrs Marland                           | 5461       |
| <b>TVOntario headquarters</b>         |            |
| Mr Arnott                             | 5460       |
| Mr Laughren                           | 5460       |
| <b>Pension funds</b>                  |            |
| Mr Phillips                           | 5461       |
| Mr Charlton                           | 5461       |
| <b>Community college governance</b>   |            |
| Mrs Cunningham                        | 5462       |
| Mr Cooke                              | 5462       |
| <b>FarmPlus program</b>               |            |
| Ms Haeck                              | 5462       |
| Mr Buchanan                           | 5462       |
| <b>Arts and cultural funding</b>      |            |
| Mr Sorbara                            | 5463       |
| Ms Ziemba                             | 5463       |

### PETITIONS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Violence</b>                                |      |
| Ms Poole                                       | 5464 |
| <b>Collingwood General and Marine Hospital</b> |      |
| Mr Jim Wilson                                  | 5464 |

|                               |      |
|-------------------------------|------|
| <b>Land-lease communities</b> |      |
| Mr Mills                      | 5465 |
| Mrs Mathysen                  | 5466 |
| <b>Adoption</b>               |      |
| Mrs McLeod                    | 5465 |
| <b>Firearms safety</b>        |      |
| Mr Eves                       | 5465 |
| Mr Wessinger                  | 5466 |
| Mr Bradley                    | 5466 |
| Mrs Fawcett                   | 5466 |
| <b>Landfill</b>               |      |
| Mr Tilson                     | 5466 |
| <b>Video games</b>            |      |
| Mrs Witmer                    | 5466 |
| <b>Long-term care</b>         |      |
| Mr Duignan                    | 5467 |

### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Time allocation, government notice of motion number 24, Mr Charlton</b> |      |
| Mr Charlton  | 5467 |
| Mr Daigeler  | 5468 |
| Mr Bradley   | 5474 |
| Mr David Johnson   | 5476 |
| Mr Murdoch   | 5480 |
| Mr Sterling  | 5482 |
| Mr Stockwell   | 5486 |
| Mr Philip  | 5486 |
| Agreed to  | 5487 |

### OTHER BUSINESS

|                                  |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Visitors</b>                  |            |
| The Speaker                      | 5453, 5464 |
| <b>Holocaust Remembrance Day</b> |            |
| Mr Harnick                       | 5453       |
| Ms Ziemba                        | 5454       |
| Mr Kwinter                       | 5455       |
| <b>Ministerial statements</b>    |            |
| Mrs Sullivan                     | 5464       |
| Mr Jim Wilson                    | 5464       |
| <b>Business of the House</b>     |            |
| Mr Charlton                      | 5487       |
| <b>Erratum</b>                   | 5487       |

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 7 avril 1994

### AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC

#### ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant des lois en ce qui concerne l'aide sociale,</b> |      |
| projet de loi 144, <i>M. Carr</i> ,                                      |      |
| deuxième lecture   | 5435 |
| Rejetée  | 5450 |
| <b>Loi de 1994 sur l'emblème avien,</b>                                  |      |
| projet de loi 147, <i>M<sup>me</sup> Murdock</i> ,                       |      |
| deuxième lecture   | 5443 |
| Adoptée  | 5451 |

CA20N  
X1  
-D23



No. 110

N° 110

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Monday 11 April 1994**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Lundi 11 avril 1994**



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

*50th anniversary*

**1944–1994**

*50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 11 April 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 11 avril 1994

The House met at 1332.

Prayers.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### FRENCH-LANGUAGE EDUCATION

### ÉDUCATION EN FRANÇAIS

**Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East):** The students from the only French adult high school were out in droves last Friday. They visited the office of the Minister of Housing and then came and visited me. Some 200 out of the 1,200 students attending the adult high school were very upset. They were protesting the closure of such a school.

Laissez-moi vous assurer que la fermeture de cette école, la seule école secondaire de langue française en Ontario pour les adultes, et qui doit fermer ses portes au mois de juin, va détruire l'avenir de ces adultes pour la simple raison que 70 % de ses étudiants sont des immigrants, et leur école, c'est leur survie.

Je peux assurer le ministre de l'Éducation qu'il doit agir dès maintenant pour sauver l'avenir de ces élèves-là. Sans ça, ces gens-là vont se retrouver dans la rue et sur le bien-être. L'argent comptant épargné aujourd'hui va sûrement nous coûter encore beaucoup plus cher lorsque ces gens-là se présenteront pour recevoir des services sociaux.

Alors, j'implore le ministre de l'Éducation de rencontrer le superviseur de la tutelle du secteur public et de tenter de trouver une solution le plus rapidement possible, afin de permettre à ces étudiants de continuer leur éducation.

### GEORGINA LEIMONIS

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** Only six days ago, the Just Desserts café was the target of a crash robbery. In a vicious and senseless act, Georgina "ViVi" Leimonis was shot and killed. She was a young, innocent, beautiful woman. This morning ViVi was buried in the wedding dress she would never use. Thousands were expected to attend to pay their respects, and we join the Leimonis family and the Greek community in mourning ViVi.

The shock and outrage of the people of this city is overwhelming. Over 200 gathered this weekend to protest the increased violence in Metro and to call for changes to the justice system. There have been three offers in a cash-for-guns scheme to get guns off the streets and, in a touching response, the café has become a shrine, with hundreds dropping off bouquets, cards and notes in ViVi's memory.

It is increasingly evident that crime is of a major concern to our citizens. It is incumbent upon governments of all levels to cooperate in strengthening the justice system so that there is a strong deterrent. We must show

the political will to respond to the demands of our law-abiding citizens who want their city back. People must be made to feel safe in their communities and we have to show the leadership necessary to make our society a safe one in which to live.

As ViVi's brother Tom pleaded, "It's got to stop here."

### OXFORD COUNTY FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** Last Friday I had the pleasure of participating in the Oxford County Federation of Agriculture's annual conference with its local elected officials. Many groups were represented: livestock and commodity producers, agricultural societies, the Women's Institute, Agriculture in the Classroom and the Ontario Ratite Association, which represents ostrich and emu producers, the newest members of Oxford's agricultural family.

This year's theme was Oxford 2000, a chance for these producer groups to discuss what they see as the future of agriculture in Oxford as well as across the country. Understandably, they expressed some concerns, including the national supply management system and how provincial allocation is not based on that province's consumption, an issue raised particularly by chicken producers.

Yet overall there was a sense of optimism that Oxford farmers would be able to meet the new challenges posed by new trading arrangements under GATT and NAFTA. The day ended with a stress on how important agriculture is to the economy of Ontario and that self-sufficiency in food production is important.

I want to remind the members of this Legislature that Ontario agriculture plays a key role in our province's economic health. While less than 3% of the population farms our land, the agrifood industry is one of our largest industries, creating direct and spinoff jobs across the province. In closing, I want to congratulate the Oxford Federation of Agriculture and others who participated in this important discussion.

### FOOD BANKS

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** Yesterday I attended the opening in my riding of the Pavilion Food-bank, a food bank that has never been needed before. It's sad that these are the kinds of invitations we're receiving now. Where is the promised social assistance reform? At the same time as I was attending that opening, the Daily Bread Food Bank here in Toronto was suggesting that there was no way they could reach their targets this year.

I bring to the attention of the House once again the standing committee on social development report on food banks of April 1990: a report the NDP signed in April 1990, a report they had requested, a report whose recommendations have been completely ignored during this entire mandate.



Where is the response to the recommendation that the ministry further refine a strategy to remove the need for food banks? Where is the response to the recommendation that the supports to employment program, STEP, be provided with sufficient resources and actively seek private sector support for it so that all those eligible will have access to its incentives to employment?

No answers, no response, no reform for the people of Ontario who must use food banks, many more, I underline, than when this report was presented in April 1990.

#### SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I am reintroducing in the House this week a private member's bill which will require persons convicted of a sexual offence involving a child under the age of 14 to register with the police within whose jurisdiction the person lives. The public will have access to information in the register and will therefore know if convicted paedophiles are living in the neighbourhood. The police will have the power to disseminate the information in the register and can notify neighbours or schools in extreme cases. The public has the right to be informed when a convicted paedophile is living within their boundaries.

The time has come to take action to deal with the dangers associated with high-risk repeat offenders, especially paedophiles and sex offenders. We as legislators must take responsibility for the fact that the existing law allowed Joseph Fredericks, an eight-time-convicted child molester, to be free when he abducted Christopher Stephenson and allowed a repeat sex offender to be released into the York Mills community upon completion of his prison term, even though the Ministry of Correctional Services considered him to be a high-risk release and psychiatrists suggested that he would strike again.

I urge the Attorney General to approach the new Solicitor General of Canada to explore ways of reforming the legal system. Public security must take priority over the individual rights of repeat offenders deemed to be high-risk releases.

1340

#### NEWSPAPER ARTICLE

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I want to stand in my place today to commend Mr Thomas Walkom of the Toronto Star for his very thought-provoking column in last Saturday's Toronto Star. Recently in this House we have witnessed the neo-right-wing agenda of the Conservative Party on a daily basis. But I want to quote Mr Walkom. He said:

"Margaret Thatcher's Britain and Ronald Reagan's America have provided glaring examples of what happens when meanness is permitted to overwhelm social policy. It did not take long to create the unemployed louts, hooligans and thugs that the British still call Thatcher's children."

Mr Harris and his like over there, who are so anxious to stick it to those folks who are on welfare, should not only read Mr Walkom's column; they should have it hung in their offices where not a moment of every day they are not reminded of just what happens if their brand of meanness is allowed to take over Ontario. Shame on all of you.

#### CANCER TREATMENT

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** The Minister of Health, as you know, did not present her new cancer strategy to this House, but I do want to respond to it here.

Firstly, we want to congratulate the ministry on the appointment of Dr Les Levin as cancer coordinator. He has a deservedly high reputation and is a strong addition to ministry personnel.

We're pleased with some of the initiatives that are included and they reflect some of the conclusions that we also reached during our Liberal task force on cancer care. Our call for urgent funding for bone marrow transplants has been recognized and we welcome the \$8-million commitment from the government which will bring hope and life to many who have been waiting for bone transplants.

We are also pleased with the steps to bring the patient into the planning circle, with the emphasis on increasing excellence in clinical care and monitoring the effectiveness of care throughout the continuum.

We are disturbed, however, that the new central coordinating committee, which is called the provincial network, has a short life, less than a year. We believe that a permanent central agency must be put in place if we are ever to have a comprehensive cancer control strategy in this province, and we regret the limited nature of this body.

Further, we are also deeply concerned that there's no government commitment to new radiation equipment to meet the needs of patients in four or five years. The process of putting that equipment in place is a lengthy and complex one, and the time for action is now. Without that commitment and without that action, one in five cancer patients will not receive the care that they need by the year 2000.

#### ORILLIA PERCH FESTIVAL

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** The Sunshine City of Orillia has quickly become one of Ontario's busiest and most popular recreation centres. Situated just west of the narrows connecting Lakes Couchiching and Simcoe, the city of Orillia provides a tremendous environment for boating and swimming as well as a prime location for thousands of anglers who are expected to visit the Sunshine City for the largest registered fishing derby of its type in North America.

The 13th annual Orillia Perch Festival, from April 23 to May 14, is sponsored each year by the Orillia and District Chamber of Commerce. It's great family fun: You just have to fish to win.

It's time to get the line wet again, get the kids out into the fresh air, win a few dollars or prizes and catch lots of the finest-tasting pan fish in all of Ontario. Catch tagged perch that are worth \$500, win a deluxe fishing boat package, big-screen television, power equipment and hundreds of great prizes of fishing, camping and outdoor equipment, as well as daily, weekly and grand prize awards for adults and kids.

Everybody is catching spring fever in Orillia. The

Sunshine City offers anglers an attractive combination of scenery, history, recreational facilities and a wide selection of quality food and shopping establishments.

For more information, call the Orillia and District Chamber of Commerce at 705-326-4424. Bring the whole family and come and perch in Orillia.

#### RACE RELATIONS IN KITCHENER-WATERLOO

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** I rise today to tell the members of this Legislature about the official opening of the Kitchener-Waterloo Race Relations Committee office, which took place March 25, 1994, at the new Kitchener city hall.

The Race Relations Committee consists of a group of concerned individuals who work together to encourage good race relations in our community. They are a group that will help if you are experiencing racism in Kitchener-Waterloo or if you want to work for the elimination of racism. The committee supports individuals and groups who are victims of racial intolerance and bigotry. The committee will help with receiving complaints, providing information to individuals, helping individuals with referrals to appropriate contacts and to follow up on referrals.

The Kitchener-Waterloo Race Relations Committee is made up of individuals and representatives of various groups, organizations and churches in the region. To name a few, there are representatives from the Kitchener-Waterloo Multicultural Centre, the city of Kitchener, the city of Waterloo, the Waterloo regional police force, the Global Community Centre, Heritage Canada, the Kitchener-Waterloo Record and representatives from the various levels of government.

There are also many individuals, such as Chloe Callender, Ashraf Beg, Rabbi David Levy, Philip Fernandez, Marcia Smellie, Theron Kramer and Rev Vincent Smith, to name a few, who are also involved in the committee.

To all of these individuals and groups I would like to say congratulations on your efforts and, on behalf of everyone not only in the Kitchener-Waterloo region but also in the province of Ontario, to thank you on your combined efforts towards the elimination of racial discrimination and racial actions.

May your efforts, combined with the efforts of our community as a whole, yield a community where individuals do not live in fear of harassment because of their racial, cultural or religious differences.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### FIRE SAFETY

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question is for the Premier. Last week we were trying to get your Minister of Housing to take action in the wake of another lost life in a basement apartment fire, which, as you will know, is the fifth fatality this year.

Premier, your Minister of Housing has absolutely refused to deal with the fact that simply legalizing basement apartments will not make them safe. In answer to the questions we keep raising, the minister keeps talking about the new regulations that will be put in place. But I ask you, what good are regulations if they

can't be enforced? Regulations that exist on paper and can't be enforced will not do anything to prevent more people from being killed in basement apartment fires.

So, Premier, I put the question to you today: Do you not agree that simply legalizing basement apartments will not ensure that they are safe to live in, and are you prepared to do what your minister has absolutely refused to do, and that is to take the necessary steps to ensure that basement apartments are not only legal but safe to live in?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'll refer that question to the Minister of Housing.

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** The prime objective of the bill which we have before the Legislature, the residents' rights legislation, is to ensure that there will be a framework within which the safety and health of residents of apartments in houses can come to pass in this province.

The situation currently is one in which over 100,000 units are illegal simply because of municipal zoning. The bill proposes to remove municipal powers to create an illegal situation for apartments in houses through zoning. Once we have removed the situation in which these apartments exist in illegality, where they are part of an underground situation, then it is possible to start dealing with health and safety matters.

No one has ever proposed that apartments which are no longer illegal because of zoning would immediately become acceptable in terms of health and safety standards, and for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that is simply misguided.

1350

**Mrs McLeod:** Although the Premier has referred the question, I'm glad he is at least in the House today to hear the way in which the minister absolutely refuses to deal with the issue that we are raising time and time again in this House because of our very real concern with exactly what the minister has said: our recognition that making the basement apartments legal is not going to do anything to make sure that they are inspected and that by being inspected, they can be required to be brought up to the regulations of the safety code.

Our primary concern has been with the 100,000 or more basement apartments which are now illegal and which become legal under your legislation. You absolutely refuse to tell us if we are being misguided in our proposals to have these basement apartments registered and therefore ensure that they can be inspected as a result of being registered. If you believe that is a misguided approach, then will you tell us how you are going to know where those 100,000 illegal basement apartments are, how many of those illegal basement apartments, which will now be legal, are in fact going to be inspected, and how you are going to ensure that those apartments are brought up to safety and fire regulations so that they will be safe places to live in. Don't just tell us our approach is wrong. Tell us what you are going to do to make these apartments safe.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** The Leader of the Opposition says that to remove the question of zoning illegality does



nothing to improve health and safety. It is the first and necessary step. It's the one she doesn't like but it is the first and necessary step. I hope that she will come to see that.

Once that is done, perhaps the Leader of the Opposition could tell us how passing a law in the Legislature of Ontario requiring registration improves health and safety. Perhaps she could tell us how.

**Mrs McLeod:** I would be delighted. If the minister is prepared to consider a system of registration to be followed by a system then of inspection, and to give municipalities the ability to put the registration and the inspection system in place, I would be more than happy to tell the minister how we believe that system could be made effective.

You've suggested that some form of registration is what will happen with new basement apartments because of building permits. That will allow you to ensure that if somebody builds their basement apartment with a building permit, it can be inspected. Therefore, it makes sense to say registration can be effective.

The question you seemed to be raising last week was, how are you going to make sure that the illegal basement apartments would in fact be registered so they can be inspected? We have suggested that there be a provision that would require that property owners report any basement apartments to their home insurer, and that any failure to indicate on your insurance policy that you do indeed have a basement apartment and that you have registered it would void the owner's home and fire insurance policy. I think the loss of insurance would be a very significant incentive to make sure that every illegal basement apartment that now became legal was in fact registered and accounted for and inspected.

I ask you today, if you're prepared to support the legitimacy of a registration process, would you be willing to work with the insurance industry to create that kind of insurance-based requirement for both the registration and inspection of basement apartments?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** The insurance industry I'm sure will be interested in any claim made by a property owner who has not told the insurance company that there is a basement apartment or an attic apartment or a side apartment. I'll leave that aside for the moment.

What is going to make this system work? What is going to make this system work, according to the Leader of the Opposition, is that as soon as we have said that zoning no longer makes the apartments in houses illegal, we make a law that makes something else say that they're illegal so that they continue to exist in an illegal situation where property owners won't step forward and get advice, find out requirements and do the work that's necessary, and where tenants won't make complaints because there's a continuing situation of illegality. This is a fantastic, unnecessary, duplicative, bureaucratic, silly approach.

What we've proposed is a very straightforward system. Property owners who have existing apartments in houses now have an obligation, once Bill 120 is passed, to meet the fire code requirements for apartments in houses and

to meet the building code requirements for apartments in houses. That's pretty straightforward. It's pretty clear to everyone, and we don't need—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** —all this extra layer of faldral that they want to attach to it.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mrs McLeod:** I can't quite believe that the proposal we've just made could have been more simple, less bureaucratic, less costly or more guaranteed to prevent future tragedies from occurring, and I'm appalled that this minister can't understand that.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My second question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. The government and the minister announced with considerable fanfare about two weeks ago that it was going to hire some 270 investigators to search out welfare fraud.

I hope we would agree that the concern, surely, is to make sure that the dollars that are going to support people who need social security support are going to those people who most need it, from the very beginning.

Our concern with the approach the government has chosen is that it is attacking the wrong problem, that the problem that needs to be attacked is the mismanagement of the system, and that problem is a problem this government has allowed to get completely out of control. It was this government's decision to eliminate home visits so that proper assessments could be made to begin with. It's this government that has failed to monitor whether students on welfare are actually attending school. It's this government that has allowed a 12-month backlog on appeals to grow, and that has tied case workers' hands.

The government's only response has been to hire investigators to go through every file to find out if they have the information that they should have had at the beginning. I ask the minister, why are you simply dealing with this problem at the end of a process rather than dealing with it at the beginning?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I suppose one could say how things change from week to week around here. I thought the last time the Leader of the Opposition was up on her feet asking me a question about abuse in the welfare system, she was in favour of our doing everything we could to ensure that there was no abuse in the system, and that is exactly what we're doing.

I would go further and say that in the three examples she has cited in terms of mismanagement of the system, I would just say to her that we need to be careful about ensuring that the information we put in front of questions is actually factual.

The number of students who are on welfare, she knows very well, is about just over 8,000 across the province. The 12-month backlog on appeals does not exist. We have a situation in which the maximum amount of time on average that it takes to get a decision is about seven months, and that's in unusual situations, and we are

looking at things we can do to deal with that. But we are doing and we will be doing more things to try to better manage the system.

The other point I would make in terms of the home visits is that there is no prohibition of home visits. That is still something that is available, and where the supervisor deems that it's appropriate to do, there are steps to be taken that can be taken to ensure that is done.

We are in fact taking some steps to ensure that our system is better managed, because we need to do that, and that's something we're going to continue to work on.

**Mrs McLeod:** I have been consistently in favour and I will continue to be in favour of ensuring that the people who need support are the ones who are getting it from the beginning rather than trying to get money back from people who should not have had it in the first place. Clearly, that is not what's happening.

According to documents we've obtained—and, Minister, we have done our best to make sure that this is absolutely accurate information documented by your own ministry—overpayments to welfare recipients now total over \$247 million, and that's what's known and documented to date to the end of December 1993. Last March, three months later into the year, the overpayments were at \$124 million. That means that in nine months, the amount of money mistakenly paid out to welfare recipients has doubled. In fact, overpayments are four times more than they were when this government took office.

I ask the minister, how can you explain a system that has allowed overpayments to reach such a degree that \$247 million that could have gone to family support, where it was needed, was needlessly wasted instead?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I can explain it very simply. I can explain it in two ways. The first is that it might interest the Leader of the Opposition to know that until we became the government there was no central tracking of overpayments. In fact, the practice that used to exist, of collecting that information centrally in days gone by, when the Conservatives were the government, was let go of when even they were the government, was certainly let go of when the Liberals were the government, but is the practice of the Ministry of Community and Social Services now that we are the government. We are taking steps to collect those overpayments.

That is something that, I think again, the Leader of the Opposition would be well advised to make sure of, that she has her facts straight before she lays blame, because sometimes the blame doesn't rest with this government; it rests with her government when it was the government.

1400

**Mrs McLeod:** I would equally ask the minister to deal with the documented facts of the case. The case load for welfare recipients, I will agree, has gone up since the time this government took office, it has doubled since the time this government took office, and I will not go into the varied reasons for that, but the fact is that overpayments are now four times what they were when this government took office. The case load has doubled and the overpayments have quadrupled. How can this minister possibly say that the problem of mismanagement rests

with anybody other than his own government?

The problem is this government's mismanagement. They are the ones who removed the requirement for home visits, they are the ones who failed to respond to escalating case loads when they saw that happening, and the only response of this government recently has been to hire people to go through every file as if somehow the people on welfare were to blame for the problem.

Instead of blaming welfare recipients for a system that is so badly flawed, why don't you turn your attention to fixing the problems that have allowed this situation to get so far out of hand? Why do you not put your money and your effort into making the system work instead of policing it to find at least \$247 million worth of mistakes after they've been made?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** Again, I'm sure that if the Leader of the Opposition would have read from the rest of her notes, they also would have indicated that there was, I think, a figure of something like \$50 million in overpayments which have been collected. Clearly, steps are being taken to collect those overpayments. There's no denying that those not only have to be collected, but that we will continue to take steps to collect them.

We are looking now at whether in some circumstances it's reasonable to request a higher repayment for some of those, but I don't think there's any denying that the system over the last few years has indeed grown beyond proportions in terms of the number of people who have had to rely on social assistance. We, in taking any actions to control and better manage the system, have always had and will always have as our basic bottom line the protection of the system for those who need it.

We do believe that it's important to continue to do that and to continue to ensure that people who are legitimately entitled to receive benefits do so. That also means taking steps to control welfare fraud and it also means taking steps to ensure that the system is run more effectively and more efficiently, and that is also what we are doing.

#### PENSION FUNDS

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** My question is for the honourable Minister of Finance. It's my understanding that the province's share of the public service pension plan will actually be \$1 billion less than projected. Do you intend to take this money and apply it to your own deficit instead of paying down the debt of the pension plan itself?

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** I will refer that question to the Chair of Management Board.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** The member is likely making reference to stories seen in the press about negotiations that are going on with OPSEU.

As a result of the passage of the amendments to the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act before Christmas, pensions are now negotiable with the Ontario Public Service Employees Union. We are at the table having some discussions on a whole range of pension matters. There have been no negotiations concluded at this point and therefore no decisions made about any matter in relation to the pensions.



**Mr Cousens:** If I had wanted to ask him a question, I would have asked him, rather than the Minister of Finance, because what I have to say really draws into the job that this Minister of Finance should be doing. When it comes to negotiating, I don't think there's any doubt that anything's on the table as far as you're concerned, including such things as those things that cannot be purchased.

Anyway, the auditor soundly reprimanded you and your government for cooking the books. The auditor even refused to endorse your books. Now I've been told, and you've just admitted it, that you're negotiating with OPSEU to do exactly what you did with the teachers. You intend to take the projected cash that is not needed for the pension and apply it to the provincial debt, instead of paying to the plan itself. You're simply robbing Peter to pay Paul.

I ask you, are you so desperate to find a way to make your deficit look better that you will cook the books for the fourth year in a row at the expense of the province's fiscal wellbeing?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Two things, very quickly, in response to the member: Firstly, the auditor did not refuse to sign the audited statements of this province. Secondly, as I've already said, the member can refer to cooking the books all he likes; we are in negotiations with a legally recognized bargaining agent around its pension plan, and to date there have been no matters resolved at that negotiating table. It is difficult to respond in the context of what we will or won't do until we reach a negotiated settlement with that legally recognized bargaining agent.

**Mr Cousens:** Ah, so in that case you may cook the books again. What you're doing is taking a billion dollars of today's money and putting it into the future for some other government to have to pay for. That's what you're doing. You're spending tomorrow's money today. If you did this in the private sector, you'd be looking out from behind bars.

By trying to make today's deficit appear smaller, you and your Minister of Finance—you're all in this together—are putting off our debt of today for future governments. Investors won't be fooled, the auditor won't be fooled, and the bond raters will not be fooled. Last week the Canadian Bond Rating Service put this government on notice that unfunded liabilities will be taken into account when it looks at the province's fiscal house. If you don't clean up your act, we could be looking at another costly downgrade.

Will you or your Minister of Finance guarantee that you will not play deficit roulette with this budget?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** The member opposite obviously doesn't understand the whole nature of pensions. The unfunded liability to which the member refers is an unfunded liability which originated with the Davis Conservative government in this province, which slid through an administration across the way. And, to give credit where credit is due, the Liberal administration, even if everybody doesn't agree with how they did it, took the initiative to ensure that that unfunded liability would be taken care of over the next 40 years.

A major part of the negotiation with OPSEU is in fact about assuring the future financial viability of that pension plan, and not, as the member would suggest, to use that plan inappropriately.

1410

#### HEAD INJURY TREATMENT

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** My question is to the Minister of Health. Five years ago, the Ontario Head Injury Association held hearings to discuss the challenges and to find solutions for persons living with the effects of injuries to the brain. Today they are again holding hearings to determine what, if any, progress has been made on this critical issue. Minister, when the head injury association issues its report card on your government's actions, do you really think you deserve a passing grade?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** Yes, I certainly do.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** As far as the families of head-injured persons are concerned, your government has failed and you've failed, because you are allowing ideology to stand in the way of compassionate, community-based care. There are a number of quality private facilities right here in Ontario that are capable of caring for persons who suffer head injuries, but you won't fund the patients who go to these facilities.

At the hearings this morning, Valerie MacLean of St Catharines told of how her son was forced to travel to the United States for treatment, and 10 years later she still cannot get adequate rehab services in Ontario.

Two weeks ago, Mike Harris raised two more examples of families separated from their loved ones because you won't fund private clinics here but you will fund clinics south of the border at a cost of more than \$500 a day more per patient.

Minister, in the name of cost-efficiency, community-based care and compassion, will you abandon your ideological stubbornness and immediately agree to fund private facilities right here in Ontario?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I'm tremendously proud of our publicly funded, publicly run health care system in this province, a system that our party long ago was a leader in creating.

Our approach with respect to the issue he raises is one that I explained to his leader a couple of weeks ago, of making sure the people of Ontario finally, after decades of having to go to the United States, find the treatment they need here in Ontario.

Since 1990, there has been \$7 million spent in enhancements to our services here in Ontario to treat people. I would agree with him that there are still some people who have to go outside the country for specialized brain-injury treatment. Our objective, our goal and our policy is to make sure we have here in Ontario the capacity to serve those people just as soon as we can.

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** I have six families who are in the United States with head trauma injuries. One of them is a 25-year-old resident of Burlington who is in a Detroit facility, part of the Margaret Montgomery Hospital in Detroit. You're paying, through your ministry, \$966 per day in US dollars. Five

of the six residents in that facility are from Ontario. The counsellors who supervise my constituent have basic high school education, and they provide basic transportation, companionship and supervision—for that kind of money.

Yet here in Hamilton-Wentworth region, we have a proactive rehabilitation opportunity, which is a head trauma care facility. It is a much higher level of support, with accredited professional personnel. These people have university-level registered nursing certificates, university training in psychosocial support, including speech therapy, yet there are three empty spaces available today in Hamilton-Wentworth region for my constituents at half the cost.

Minister, why is it that you don't even have the capacity to consider the three elements of this case we're trying to bring to your attention: that we can get a better level of care for Ontario residents, recognizing the professional service—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member conclude his question, please.

**Mr Jackson:** —that we can get care close to home for the families so they can be supportive and part of the solution and part of our long-term care vision; and finally, that they will get better value as taxpayers because you can treat two Ontarians at home for every one you're paying for in the United States.

Will you open your mind and look at this program? It is much better and of less cost and greater care for our citizens. Please.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** As I think I've acknowledged in my response to questions on this issue, there are still some services that we are not equipped to provide in Ontario which people go out of Ontario to receive. If there is a comparable service in one of our hospitals here in Ontario or as part of our long-term care system, then of course I would agree with the member that it makes a great deal of sense to provide that care here in Ontario.

I don't know the specific cases he's referring to, but I have not at this point found a case of somebody who was in the US receiving services that were already being provided here in Ontario through our hospital health care system where we did not make every effort to bring that person back close to home. That's the objective.

**The Speaker:** New question, the member for Halton Centre.

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** I suggest, as a follow-up to the previous question, that the minister look into this issue, because there are indeed alternatives that have not been followed.

#### CANCER TREATMENT

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** My question, however, relates to cancer and the cancer care strategy which the minister announced last Friday. The paper indicates that the Ministry of Health, and I just want to quote here, "will play a more active role in setting the research agenda and the Ministry of Health will identify priorities for cancer research in the province."

I wonder if the Minister of Health would advise the House today how this new ministry involvement will impact on the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research

Foundation and on the Ontario Cancer Institute, each of which has specific research mandates, each of which follows established research protocols, including peer review, each of which participates not only in provincial clinical trials but in international trials; what effect the new intervention of the Ministry of Health in research will have on these bodies.

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** The creation for the very first time of a provincial strategy with respect to cancer and the fact that that strategy deals with the entire spectrum, from prevention to early detection to treatment and to support services, will mean that all the interventions and activities of the government through the cancer network, which is going to be broadly representative of all of the stakeholders in the system, will mean that we will be doing the research that supports that system, that improves the quality of life of the people with cancer and that makes sure that the consumers of the system have a voice in what both the priorities and the kinds of treatment and support services required are, something that people with cancer have been asking for for many, many years.

**Mrs Sullivan:** The minister clearly did not respond to the question I put. The question I put was specifically with respect to new interventions by the Ministry of Health in determining the priorities for cancer research in Ontario.

We would be very interested in knowing from the minister what specific expertise exists now within the Ministry of Health to define and prioritize cancer research; how many new people will be hired, because it seems to us that that expertise does not exist within the ministry; how much new money will be added to Ministry of Health research activities; and how many resources, both human and financial, will in consequence be removed from the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation and from the Ontario Cancer Institute as a result of this new policy.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** The spectre of removal of funding from the cancer treatment system or from one part of the system that the member raises is not very helpful as we attempt to have a constructive dialogue, as her party's task force had I think done some months ago, about how to deal with a real and very growing problem. Obviously, the specific questions she asks will be answered as part of the network's work and one of the work groups of that network.

With respect to the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, let me remind her of the quote in one of the newspapers after I released the strategy, from Dr Charles Hollenberg, who "said that he was 'very pleased' with the government's new strategy." He called it "very imaginative and very badly needed to successfully resolve the pressing issues facing the cancer system now and in the future." That's what our government has done, that's what people have been calling for, and that's the kind of progress and action that will take us forward into the future.

#### METROPOLITAN TORONTO POLICE CHIEF

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** My question is to the Premier. I would like to ask you about one of your



political appointments. It was reported in this weekend's Toronto Sun that Susan Eng, your appointment to chair Metro Toronto's Police Services Board, would like to see Chief Bill McCormack retire as soon as possible.

Premier, do you support this junior tax lawyer's position that Chief McCormack should no longer continue as chief of police for Metropolitan Toronto?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I would refer this question to the Solicitor General.

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** The honourable member knows very well that decisions of that sort are the responsibility of the local police services board, and this situation is absolutely no different. I don't know what it is he's trying to achieve by that question.

1420

**Mr Harnick:** Might I tell you that the public stands firmly behind Chief McCormack, and given a choice, the public would choose Chief McCormack over Susan Eng in a skinny minute.

It has become obvious that policing in Toronto is suffering due to the never-ending conflict between Susan Eng, whom you appointed as chair, and Chief McCormack. At the time when our city needs the cooperation of all those responsible for policing, will you listen to the public and ensure that Police Chief McCormack is reappointed and that Ms Eng is retired?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** Let me say this with regard to that question. First of all, on a personal note, let me say that I have an excellent working relationship with Chief McCormack, as I have attempted to do with all of the chiefs of this province in my capacity as the Solicitor General. I have the highest regard for him and his professionalism, and I have an equally high regard for the job Susan Eng is doing and the members of that police services board.

These are extremely difficult times. We are very much moving to community-based policing, a relatively new philosophy that requires a new dynamic between police and police services. The Metro leadership, given the circumstances that are in front of them and the difficulties they have faced, are doing as good a job as one can expect. In many ways, the work they are doing on a day-to-day basis is pioneering the new kind of community-based policing that is supported all across North America.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The Chair of Management Board has a reply to a question asked earlier by the honourable member for Mississauga North.

#### GOVERNMENT SPENDING

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** That's correct. I'd like to respond to the member's question.

During the Liberal administration, the Macdonald Block and many of its rooms sat empty a large percentage of the time. Fortunately, that's no longer the case. The meeting rooms in the Macdonald Block are presently operating at well over 90% of capacity. It was not possible for the social contract secretariat to conduct its planning meetings at the Macdonald Block because they were booked full. Other locations were investigated by the secretariat, and they decided on the Eaton house.

Second, the facilitator negotiated a contract for a flat fee, not a per diem rate, as the member alleged. His contract included all preparation, conducting the seminars and any follow-up work that may be necessary as a result of the sessions.

Intense planning sessions were needed because, if the member opposite is not aware, the social contract secretariat oversees 7,000 local collective agreements affecting 800,000 employees in this province. If we weren't planning, the member would be on his feet. Now he's on his feet because we are planning.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** What the minister has said is very interesting, but he has not responded to my question.

The question I posed, which the minister has now had two weeks to respond to, is why did all the people in the social contract secretariat have to travel for a two-day retreat to the Eaton Hall inn and conference centre? Why did they have to go with a facilitator? How much money was spent, when all these individuals work in the same office under the same roof? Why was it necessary that they had to expend this money for that amount of time when so many other things could be done? What is the justification for the expense, which you have not yet told us, for the social contract secretariat to move in bulk from one place to another for a two-day retreat?

I've given you two weeks to answer. The least you can do is inform this Legislature how you can justify this type of retreat when so many other people are asking the same question: where the priorities of that government happen to be.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** First, I've said and said clearly that there were no accommodations available here that were adequate. Second, and I sometimes think it is an occasion when anger is not the best response, but those rascals across the way oversaw a rise in operational government spending in this province of 61% between 1985 and 1990. In the first two years this government was in place, we reduced those operating costs by 11%. The Liberals' transportation costs rose 53% during their administration. We've reduced those travel costs to which he refers by 20%. We reduced our overall telecommunications budget by 4%. But most importantly, on the issue he raises specifically, when it comes to the rental of accommodation and space, we've reduced the cost by 53%, by good management.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** New question, the honourable member for Simcoe East.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** Thank you, Mr Speaker—

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** Whoa.

**The Speaker:** No, not yet. As unusual as it may be, my error. By rotation, it is the opposition's turn, and the honourable member for St George-St David.

**Mr Murphy:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I'm glad to be able to point that out to you.

#### POLICE SERVICES

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** My question is to the Solicitor General. I am pleased that the Solicitor General is considering my leader, Lyn McLeod's, request

to refer that to committee; I hope it will be the case. In the interim, however, I hope we can continue to do certain things in the justice field.

He referred, in the question previously put, to his support for community policing, and I think we all support that. Some statistics that I think support the need for that: Between 1985 and 1993, robberies went from 2,560 in Metro Toronto to 5,265. In Regent Park, for example, in my community, there were seven shootings in seven weeks last year. Yet at the same time, unfortunately, due to cuts, each police station in Metro has a reduced police force of 10 to 18 officers, and in Regent Park, where community policing is highly effective and in fact demanded by the members of my constituency, there has been a reduction of 33% in foot patrols in recent months and years.

My question to the Solicitor General is, given that we have a budget upcoming, what will he do to commit to us and the people of Metropolitan Toronto that he will see a commitment to providing police with the resources they need to provide effective community policing?

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** There is a whole host of things we have done and continue to do through my ministry. As the honourable member knows, as the critic for this ministry, my ministry does provide the procedures and the protocols and guidelines and standards for police services; however, it is the responsibility of each and every individual police service to determine how they will carry out those responsibilities and where they will place their resources.

Some of the initiatives we have implemented: In addition to providing recent standards on bias-motivated crimes, on domestic assault, wife assault, abuse, on a whole range of issues, we've also provided over \$2 million for training. I recently opened up the new firing range at the Ontario Police College, which allows us to implement our use-of-force training. We have a whole host of race relations training and initiatives, which have a lot to do with the ability to have focused, community-based policing.

I would say to the member that at every opportunity I continue to work personally and my ministry officials work with the local services boards to implement and introduce the whole philosophy, in a real, meaningful way, of community-based policing.

**Mr Murphy:** There is no police officer who works in my riding who accepts any of that as at all being effective in reducing crime in downtown Toronto. As an example, 51 Division, between July and December alone, recorded 460 weapons offences and five people on record who have been victims of gunshot events. For the minister to say that somehow opening a weapons range is going to solve that is not quite adequate.

1430

I'd like to point to another example. It's clear when you talk to police officers that drugs play a central role in much of this criminal activity. For example, a constituent of mine stood at a corner in one area of my riding and watched cabs come in. There are 15, 16 pages recording hundreds of cabs going to a certain area,

because while Regent Park has an unfortunate reputation, much of it comes from people coming from outside to commit their criminal activity.

I'd like to ask the Solicitor General, we have taxi drivers coming from all across, some of them repeated, to one corner to do drug deals, who are staying for a minute. There are literally hundreds of them. Will he work with the Ministry of Transportation and his own officials to work on the drug problem in downtown Toronto to see what he can do to assist in community policing, to talk to the taxi owners to see what they can do to help the people in my community to reduce crime?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** Let me say, with regard to the last part of the member's question, that the issue he raises is very much the direct responsibility of the Metro police service and it wouldn't be appropriate for me to suggest that I would in any way directly intrude on an operational matter that is their responsibility.

Having said that, that police service, like every other, knows that if it requires any kind of assistance that one of our ministries can provide, we're certainly available to work with it to provide it.

Let me also correct something and make sure there's not an impression left in the member's mind that's incorrect. I did not suggest for a minute that the opening of a new firing range or other facilities, or training money in and of itself, was going to solve the problem of initiating community-based policing. I was, however, expressing a clear opinion that I believe this government has been working with police services in moving forward in the transition towards community-based policing.

Let me close by quoting from the parliamentary secretary to the current Liberal Solicitor General of Canada, who says, in terms of crime prevention, "To be truly effective, the prevention of crime must involve examining the underlying social and economic factors associated with crime and criminality: the root causes of crime, such as poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, alcohol and substance abuse and family violence, to name but a few." We would agree with that, and we continue to work with communities and police services on all the issues that affect crime so that we can have as safe streets in the province of Ontario as we can.

#### JOB SECURITY

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** My question is for the Premier. Mr Premier, last week you were out around the province talking to small business and industry. Eighty jobs are on the line at Stepan Canada near Orillia. The soap manufacturer depends on the railway. There are about 140 cars of raw materials that have to come in there every year.

What steps have you taken, Mr Premier, to keep companies like Stepan Canada still in business? The 80 workers are concerned. There are thousands of others in Simcoe county who work for companies that depend on short rail lines for survival. What can we tell the people now with regard to the railways, that they will continue to have their jobs?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'll refer this to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade.



**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I can assure the member that this is an active file which is currently being coordinated between the ministries of Economic Development and Trade, Transportation and Labour. All three ministries are actively involved in seeking a solution that will in fact ensure continued service and access for the companies of those areas. We take the issue and the challenge very seriously.

Specifically, I myself, as well as my colleagues, have had a number of discussions with the community and with CN. I spoke to the head of CN in February, March 21 I had a phone conversation and March 31 I hosted a meeting in which the Minister of Transportation, Deputy Minister of Transportation and officials, Deputy Minister of Labour and officials, and deputy minister from MEDT and officials and myself met with M. Tellier and other individuals from CN, at which we explored their intentions with respect to lifting of the rail should the National Transportation Agency of Canada decision in June come down in support of CN's abandonment.

I am hopeful that we will have a positive response from CN on this. In the meantime, we are meeting with parties, including some of the unions involved, to see if we can facilitate an agreement or an approach that would be the solution for the area in Simcoe that you raised but also provincially, because, as you know, CN is looking at abandonment of lines in other areas of the province.

**Mr McLean:** Minister, I have a letter from the warden of Simcoe county to the Premier. You've been copied with it. The Ministry of Labour, the Minister of Transportation and the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation have been copied with that letter; all the mayors; industrial development commissioners. There have been an awful lot of meetings that have taken place within the county of Simcoe over this very issue. Time is money. It's costing these people money. The warden wants to set up a meeting with the Premier and yourself immediately to discuss this very issue. What can I tell the people today at Stepan Canada? Are they going to lose their jobs or are they not?

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I understand the seriousness with which the member poses the question. I want to assure him that in terms of the lines, there are two or three lines that are affected by this direction from CN to abandon these particular rail lines. We have in fact met. The Premier personally met with the mayor of Collingwood and a delegation of businesses from that area, and I've had the opportunity to have discussions with those individuals and I'm well aware of the community support and the business interest and potential of a community solution to running the line in the future.

I think you can assure the people that, one, there are three ministers who are actively working on this; that I am well aware of it from the point of view of economic development and the importance in terms of maintaining jobs; that I have as recently as within the last week and a half, with other ministers, met with CN to ask them to give us the time to work out a local, provincial community solution to this problem, which, I will reassert, is a problem which has been imposed on us by a policy

decision of Canadian National with respect to abandonment of rail lines. We are going to have to deal with the result of that, but we are taking a leadership role in dealing with the result of that.

I understand the importance in the community but I also say to the member that in fact this is an issue of importance to several Ontario communities, and we are looking for a provincial response.

#### FOREST MANAGEMENT

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. The minister would know that a number of people within the forest industry have been watching quite closely and actually participating in a process that the minister started in order to develop a forest renewal policy for the province of Ontario.

I know from meeting with people in my riding, the riding of Cochrane South, and some of the people from Timiskaming and from the honourable member across for Cochrane North that there are a number of people in the forest industry who are really wondering what it is exactly that this government is up to when we talk about forest renewal.

I understand that this morning you were in Thunder Bay. You made an announcement on behalf of your ministry and this government in regard to the direction of that forest renewal policy, and I'm wondering if you can share with the House exactly what you announced this morning in Thunder Bay.

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** We have been talking with the forest industries of Ontario over the past year about establishing a new business relationship with them. There are about four components to it. The first is that we want to establish a forest renewal trust fund which will set aside money every year which will be dedicated to renewing the forest. We believe that we, through a forest renewal trust fund, will be able to invest more money in renewing the forest than ever before.

Secondly, the new business relationship will involve working out more flexible options with private industry. In British Columbia, by following a new business relationship the British Columbia government reduced the cost of forest renewal from \$780 million a year to \$250 million a year and at the same time achieved better forest renewal.

We believe there are real cost efficiencies in what we're doing. There is also a new stumpage system, something that industry has asked for and which we believe will be more efficient and more market-sensitive.

**Mr Bisson:** I think what a lot of people are concerned about is exactly what this new stumpage system is all about. I know from speaking to some of the people in the industry that they fear that the stumpage system is meaning to say in the end that they'll be left with a larger share of the overall responsibility but also the entire cost. They want to have some assurance from the minister of exactly what we're talking about when we're talking about a new stumpage system.

**Hon Mr Hampton:** In the past, all of the money from

the stumpage fee system has accrued to the consolidated revenue fund. What we're talking about now is a new stumpage system which would result in a significant portion of stumpage fees being dedicated to a forest renewal fund, so those people who work in the forest would actually be funding their future jobs and the future health of the forest. We think that is long overdue, something that the province probably should have tried about 20 years ago.

1440

The new stumpage system will be market-sensitive in the sense that when forest products companies, let us say in the pulp and paper sector, are not achieving high prices, the stumpage fee will drop. However, there will always be a portion of the stumpage fee which must go to forest renewal. When companies such as the lumber industry, which is now doing very well, achieve very high prices, then the people of Ontario will receive a return on the public resources that are being used.

#### TRANSPORTATION FOR THE DISABLED

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** My question is to the Minister of Transportation. We are now in the second week of the disabled wheel transit system, and of the 139 Wheel-Trans buses, only 35 are operating. Individuals, as you know, are unable to go to work; people are unable to get to their doctor. The real bottom line is that they are denied a way of life. Mr Minister, what alternative transportation are you going to provide for these people who are out of transportation now?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** What the member opposite reminds us of, in the collective, is the human dimension, those less fortunate people who rely on the essential service that this government has increased its financial commitment to by more than 50% in the last four years, recognizing the marketplace, the number of people who are dependent on the essential service.

Because of a faulty steering column, because of recalls, because the units have to be taken off the road to ensure the safety and reliability of the system, we have worked in close liaison with people responsible for the system, people at the municipal level, to ensure that, for instance hypothetically, Ira Smith, having to go to a dialysis machine, will not be impacted.

It's my understanding that within one week, or eight or nine days max, everything will be back to normal and people will still be able, as they were yesteryear, to look to that service on a daily basis. Thank you kindly.

**Mr Curling:** All those people who are being denied that now are not feeling any better with all this poetic thing you're throwing around. People aren't feeling any better about that. I ask you, what alternative plans are you making?

Mr John Feld, director of Trans-Action Coalition, states that "the shutdown of services is only the latest wrinkle in the Wheel-Trans crisis." The disabled community feels that they are treated like second-class citizens, Mr Minister.

You and your Premier, I know, trumpeted the four new subway lines that would be built. Those, of course, are

quite naturally for the able-bodied, which is good news to those people. But the other people are feeling, "Are we being left out in all this?"

When will you admit, Mr Minister, that your government continues to neglect the needs of the disabled community and does not serve the needs, the demands? The needs of many people today, as you know, are not being met, because even the requests for transportation are not being reached today. When will you admit that you are not doing sufficient, and that you are treating these people as second-class citizens?

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** It is rather appalling and somewhat shocking when the member opposite wishes to catastrophize or to portray a situation in its extreme, when the facts that are with me are the very opposite. The member, and I'm quoting him verbatim, says, "Treating people as second-class citizens," neglecting the challenge.

Let me share this with you: In 1989, the provincial contribution to the Wheel-Trans system was \$13.3 million; 1991, \$19.1 million; 1993, \$22.2 million—almost double in a period of four years. If this is not taking your role seriously, if this is neglecting the people who need the service the most, the figures here will speak for themselves.

We are committed. I welcome the member's opinion. It is current. The system is not only being rectified but steps are being taken to develop policy so that this kind of situation in the future will be dealt with in the collective between Metro and the province more expeditiously.

#### LAND USE PLANNING

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and is about the Sewell commission and about the response of the government, A New Approach to Land Use Planning.

Mr Minister, in your response and release of December 14, you indicated that planning in Ontario requires clear direction. You said that the planning process should be streamlined, you said that the approvals process should be shortened and you indicated that there should be greater local control of the development process.

I have to tell you, Mr Minister, that there's a great deal of scepticism about A New Approach to Land Use Planning in terms of achieving those goals. The home builders' association, for example, says that the policy statements will not achieve streamlining. AMO has concerns about them. The county planning directors of Ontario have indicated that they will effectively stop most rural development.

Now, Mr Minister, we have the planning focus of your government, the NDP government, which lists the Sewell commission reforms under the category of the environment.

Now the question: Is the land use planning document a planning reform document or is it an environmental document? Will it speed up planning, or is it going to slow down planning, as most people fear?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** I'd certainly disagree with the statement that most people feel it would slow down planning. That certainly has not been the indication of the development industry that I've met



with. It certainly was not the indication from AMO when I met with it last week.

In terms of the rural part of your question, I met only this morning with the reeves from the townships of Kingston, Pittsburgh, Ernestown, Sidney and Elizabeth. We were looking at alternative ways of dealing with some of the Sewell recommendations so that it would speed up the planning process and the development process in their areas.

Across the province, as the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs will tell you, there is tremendous support for the Sewell recommendations. We intend to implement them. You will see the legislation. It will protect the environment. It will encourage development in both rural and urban areas, and it will cut down on the bureaucracy which your government created when you were in power.

### MOTIONS

#### COMMITTEE SITTINGS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that the standing committee on resources development may meet at times other than those specified in the order of the House dated April 20, 1993, and beyond its normal adjournment time for the purpose of consideration of Bill 143, An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and to amend the Education Act in respect of French-Language School Boards.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is it the pleasure of the House that motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

Opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

I declare the motion carried.

### PETITIONS

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Ron Eddy (Brant-Haldimand):** A petition to the Legislative Assembly:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters' advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,"

1450

"We, the undersigned, petition the Premier, Solicitor General and the Legislative Assembly to change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

It's signed by 18 constituents.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition with 133 signatures that's addressed to the Legislative Assembly.

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I have signed this document.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I have a petition here, addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, from my constituents in Twin Elms in the riding of Middlesex. They petition the Legislature as follows:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

On behalf of those seniors, I have indeed signed my name to this petition.

#### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I am pleased to present a petition, on behalf of over 500 residents of Metro Toronto, to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the British North America Act of 1867 supports the right of Catholic students to a Catholic education and the province of Ontario supports two educational systems from kindergarten to grade 12/OAC;

"Whereas the Metropolitan Separate School Board educates more than 103,000 students across Metropolitan Toronto and whereas this is equivalent to 30% of all students in the area;

"Whereas the Metropolitan Separate School Board is expected to provide the same programs and services as its public school counterpart and must do so by receiving \$1,822 less for each elementary school student and \$2,542 less per secondary school student (based on 1993

estimates, Ministry of Education and Training published statistics);

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act now to ensure that Ontario's two principal education systems are funded fully and equally."

I have signed this petition.

#### VIDEO GAMES

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that has been signed by residents in Waterloo, New Hamburg, Guelph, Ariss and Mississauga. It reads as follows:

"Whereas the Theatres Act was amended in 1984 with the intention of keeping certain viewing materials away from children and advances in technology have occurred to such an extent that the concern for children covered by this legislation is negated as it does not cover electronically produced images that are part of video and computer games; and

"Whereas there has been a disturbing increase in the proliferation of violent and sexually explicit video games; and

"Whereas the government of Ontario should be making every effort to regulate the distribution of adult video games and ensure that games designed for adults are clearly marked as such; and

"Whereas Bill 135, the Theatres Amendment Act, 1993, a private member's bill introduced by Waterloo North MPP Elizabeth Witmer, would amend the definition of 'film' so that the electronically produced images that are part of video and computer games come within the purview of the act, particularly the classification system;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Bill 135 be passed by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as quickly as possible."

This petition was sent to me by Sheila McWilliams, and I'm pleased to sign it.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** On behalf of about 700 constituents who live in my riding and in a mobile home park in Wilmot Creek and on behalf of the other hundreds of constituents who live in various trailer parks situated in my riding, I have been asked to petition, addressed to the Legislative Assembly:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:"—and I hope the Conservative member from Mississauga is listening—

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

I've put my name to this petition.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Frank Micalash (Kenora):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, which reads:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I have signed my name to that petition as well.

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** My petition reads as follows:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

#### LAP DANCING

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** I have a petition that says:

"Whereas the recent court decision has declared lap dancing legal in Canada, which involves the physical interaction between nude entertainers and patrons and includes many sexual acts commonly provided by prostitution,

"Therefore, we request that the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien, Prime Minister of Canada; the Honourable Herb Gray, Solicitor General of Canada; the Honourable Allan Rock, Minister of Justice and Attorney General for Canada; and the Honourable Marion Boyd, Attorney General of the province of Ontario, be petitioned to



amend the Criminal Code to establish clearly sexual acts which are illegal in liquor licence premises generally accessible by the public, and prescribe definitions of conduct which are criminal, and clarify acceptable community standards which will prohibit lap dancing and its attendant activities from occurring."

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** I'm pleased to present one of the largest petitions I've ever presented to this Legislature in nearly 20 years, a petition signed by thousands of my constituents in the Pembroke and Renfrew county area, a petition to the Legislative Assembly which reads in part that to prevent future automobile accidents:

"We, the undersigned, would like to see an overpass at the intersection of Highways 417 and 41 near the city of Pembroke. If an overpass is not feasible, then we would like to see the following options:

"(1) A speed limit reduction to 50 kilometres per hour in all directions within a mile radius of that intersection;

"(2) Move all light standards further away from the side of the highway;

"(3) Put sand barrels around the base of all light standards."

I'm happy to sign and support this petition. I want to indicate that this petition was largely prepared by two young men, Kevin and John Neuman, whose brother was tragically killed at this intersection just before Christmas.

#### RETAIL SALES TAX

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** I have a petition here.

"We petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We oppose the BOP tax," or the brew-on-premises tax, "initiated by the government of Ontario on August 1, 1993. We challenge you as to its legal fidelity and question the government's concern for small business development and growth. This tax will undoubtedly directly affect the survival of this industry."

As a member, I affix my signature to it.

#### ÉDUCATION EN FRANÇAIS

**M. Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa-Est) :** Je voudrais présenter une pétition qui m'est parvenue par l'entremise des adultes Le Carrefour :

«Attendu que, depuis sa fondation en 1992, la population de l'École des adultes Le Carrefour ne cesse de croître et, au cours des dernières années, de s'adjoindre un nombre considérable et croissant de néo-Canadiens et néo-Canadiennes ;

«Attendu que, depuis 1987, l'École des adultes Le Carrefour occupe un site aménagé spécialement pour répondre aux besoins de la population adulte ;

«Attendu que ce site se trouve au carrefour de la population francophone de façon très centrale, à la région desservie par le Conseil scolaire de langue française d'Ottawa-Carleton, section publique, et avec un arrêt d'autobus devant l'entrée ;

«Nous, soussignés, résidents et résidentes de l'Ontario, demandons au premier ministre de l'Ontario de prendre les mesures afin d'empêcher la fermeture et la vente de l'édifice de la rue Donald ainsi que la relocalisation du

programme de l'École des adultes Le Carrefour.»

Cette pétition est signée par tout près de 1000 élèves et je me joins à eux pour signer la pétition.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** I have a petition signed by the Woodslee Prayer Community, addressed to the Honourable Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario to refrain from passing Bill 45," the bill that was presented in this House by the Liberal member for St George-St David.

I support their petition.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Oriole):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the New Democratic Party has always said it was against user fees in health care and other social services; and

"Whereas the NDP promised it would never implement user fees for health care and other social services; and

"Whereas the NDP has bowed to the pressure from the Conservative Party and is now working to implement user fees in a number of areas; and

"Whereas the NDP government is now planning to implement a number of user fees by charging for various necessary drug treatments, for annual checkups, psychiatric counselling and speech therapy for children and other necessary services; and

"Whereas the NDP is trying to fool the public by saying that these are not user fees, but rather copayments; and

"Whereas it has been shown that user fees do not make health services more accountable—user fees only restrict access,

"We, the undersigned, urge the NDP government to reconsider its new policy on user fees and protect the integrity of our universal health care system by cancelling its proposed user fees on essential health services."

I support this and I will be signing my name.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON AND FRENCH-LANGUAGE SCHOOL BOARDS STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

##### LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT DES LOIS CONCERNANT LA MUNICIPALITÉ RÉGIONALE D'OTTAWA-CARLETON ET LES CONSEILS SCOLAIRES DE LANGUE FRANÇAISE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading, Bill 143, An Act to amend certain Acts related to The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and to amend the Education Act in respect of French-Language School Boards / Projet de loi 143, Loi modifiant certaines lois relatives à la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et la Loi sur l'éducation en ce qui a trait aux conseils scolaires de langue française.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Pursuant to the order of the House dated April 7, I am now required to put the question on second reading of Bill 143. Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."  
All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1505 to 1510.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time.

#### Ayes

Abel, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooper, Dadamo, Duignan, Farnan, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huguet, Jamison, Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), Klopp, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip (Etobicoke-Rexdale), Pilkey, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Swarbrick, Ward, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Winninger, Wiseman, Ziemba.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please rise one at a time.

#### Nays

Arnott, Bradley, Caplan, Carr, Conway, Cunningham, Daigeler, Eddy, Eves, Grandmaitre, Harnick, Henderson, Hodgson, Jackson, Johnson (Don Mills), Kwinter, Mahoney, Marland, Miclash, Murphy, O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau), Poole, Ramsay, Ruprecht, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Wilson (Simcoe West), Witmer.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The ayes are 58; the nays are 29. I declare the motion carried.

#### RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

#### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA TAXE DE VENTE AU DÉTAIL

Mr Sutherland, on behalf of Mr Laughren, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 138, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act / Projet de loi 138, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la taxe de vente au détail.

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** This bill puts into place the changes announced in the 1993 Ontario budget.

The bill proposes—

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Order. I would encourage you to carry on your conversations outside of the House. The member for Oxford.

**Mr Sutherland:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, this bill puts into place the changes announced in the 1993 Ontario budget.

The bill proposes to apply retail sales tax to premiums paid under insurance contracts, group insurance, funded or unfunded benefit plans, effective May 20, 1993. The major exemptions include individual policies for life, health and physical wellbeing and reinsurance, farm and crop insurance, marine insurance, unemployment insurance and workers' compensation. A special rate of 5% will apply to auto insurance, covering all licensed vehicles.

Tax will also be applied to charges made for parking,

effective July 1, 1993. No tax will apply to residential parking.

Effective July 1, 1993, sand, gravel, clay, soil and unfinished stone in any quantity will be taxable.

A new tax is proposed on beer or wine made by persons at a produce-your-own outlet for their own consumption, effective August 1, 1993. The tax rates have been graduated over the period of August 1, 1993, at 26 cents per litre of beer or wine produced to June 15, 1995, when the tax will be 38 cents per litre of beer or wine produced. This is a flat tax applicable to the quantity of beer or wine delivered to the customer and is due at the time of delivery.

Finally, retail sales tax will be charged on replacement parts used in the repair of taxable goods under warranty and maintenance contracts. This is effective May 20, 1993. If a company performs warranty repairs on items which it sold, the tax is due on the cost of parts used in performing these repairs.

The \$5 tire tax on new tires is removed, and that was effective May 20, 1993.

The Ontario—Incredible! rebate program was eliminated effective July 1, 1993. Although the Ontario—Incredible! program was intended to encourage tourists, less than 1% of the visitors to the province filed claims. Certain large businesses benefited by substantial refunds on business trips. Clearly, this program was not meeting its intended purpose. Significant administrative costs were involved in the manual processing of these claims.

To help combat the underground economy, some penalties under the act are increased.

Other administrative changes include a relaxing of procedures for bad-debt claims and adjustments to the interest calculation rules for both amounts owing and refunds.

That outlines some of the technical purposes of the bill, as I said, implementing some of the changes as were outlined in the 1993 budget.

I hope that as part of the debate, while no one likes tax increases or supports them, we remember the context of the budget in 1993. Of course if the government had not done anything at that time, we would have been looking at a deficit of well over \$16 billion. The government took a three-pronged approach to deal with that situation in terms of what we did with the social contract and the savings achieved through that, savings achieved through the expenditure control plan and the third portion of that, of course, the increase in taxes and non-tax revenue outlined in the budget.

These were very difficult situations. We understand that not everyone was supportive of them at the time, but I think the nice thing about doing this bill at this time is that people can see the results of our efforts and that we were very successful in containing the deficit and making a substantial reduction, not only in what the projected deficit would have been if we hadn't made any changes but our successful efforts in reducing the deficit from the previous fiscal year, almost a 20% reduction in the deficit.

I think that speaks very well of the strategy that the



government outlined, and this bill is part of that strategy, but also in terms of how this government is dealing with the very serious issue of getting the deficit under control, how we're looking after the fiscal situation of the province and of the government in very difficult times, having to deal with a lot of systems that have been built up over many years by previous governments that in effect weren't managed very effectively. We're having to take the tough decisions to deal with them because unfortunately the bill has come due in the 1990s.

1520

I look forward to the debate and I look forward to knowing where the opposition parties—I'm sure they are going to be critical because as we've heard time and time again, "No tax increases," but I would hope that while they're putting that forward, they will present options as to what they would have done in this situation.

I have a good idea where the third party has stood on some of these issues, but I'm not quite sure where the official opposition has been on its fiscal situation. The leader has said they wanted more significant cuts in spending and that they wanted no tax increases. They also wanted the deficit to come down substantially and they also said they wanted to maintain services. I think the people of Ontario are realistic enough to know that those things don't all add up.

We'll look forward in the debate to hearing what the economic strategy is, but more importantly, what the true fiscal strategy is of the official opposition. With those comments, I look forward to the rest of the debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Questions or comments?

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I'm fascinated that you would know what the Conservatives think and you don't know what the Liberals think. It's one thing to stand over there and even think you know what your own government thinks, let alone assume that you could predict what the Liberals are going to do.

I am looking forward more to the debate coming up to what the Liberals have to say than even what you have to say, because they're the ones who brought in the tire tax in 1989 and they had all kinds of apologies and explanations for it. If there's anything that's going to be fascinating that comes out of the debate this afternoon, it is how the Liberals respond to this, because they had such a commitment then that one would hope there was some meaning or truth or validity to all the points they had to make.

From the honourable parliamentary assistant, I sense a touch of humour coming through him that says, "The Liberals really are hard to read." When they were in power, they went and brought this tire tax in and it was quite an imposition. It raised a heap of money.

I'd be interested in knowing, just to give you a chance to reply—what I've said so far doesn't give you much chance to say too much except off topic, which is pretty easy for you. What I wanted to ask you is, would you be so kind as to tell us how many dollars were raised by the government since the tire tax was imposed?

The second part of the question is, how much in your estimation was spent on environmental purposes? That

would be very, very helpful and appreciated, because the intention of the bill in the first place was to raise taxes, but then also both Mr Nixon and Mr Grandmaître were clear in saying this would assist the government in its whole role to fight for environmental needs. I would look forward to your comments on this matter.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further questions or comments? If not, the member for Oxford, you have two minutes.

**Mr Sutherland:** I thank the member for Markham for his comments. The reason I know where the third party stands, of course, is that we know they are in a battle to try and demonstrate to the people that their policies are better than the Reform Party of Canada policies. We know they're in a battle to out-reform the Reform Party, so it's very clear to know where they're at.

With respect to his comments regarding the tire tax, I don't have the exact figure, but I certainly know that when that tax was brought in, it was sold to the people of Ontario that the money would specifically go to deal with the problem of used tires. We do know that a lot of revenue came in and of course that revenue went into the consolidated revenue fund, so we couldn't track specifically where the funds went, but we certainly know that not all the funds were spent on recycling and finding other uses for used tires.

Clearly, it did not fit the mandate it was supposed to. I am happy to report to the member for Markham and to the House that since 1990 and beyond, the government has done a very effective job, first of all under the leadership of the former Minister of the Environment, the Honourable Ruth Grier, and continued under the current Minister of Environment and Energy, the Honourable Bud Wildman, who made tremendous strides on getting a handle on the problem of used tires.

Let me just say, too, that the other problem in determining the actual amount of how much came in from the tire tax was that the amounts were sent in with the retail sales tax returns. They were not shown separately, so it's very hard to get a specific amount, but treasury has estimated in the past that it was about \$35 million a year.

I just want to say that I'm pleased with the efforts our government has done to get a handle on that very, very serious problem.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further debate?

**Mr Cousens:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Inasmuch as I asked a question and it was a simple one, is there any chance that the honourable member would get me the answer before I have my turn? Your people should have that information.

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Orion):** As revenue critic for the official opposition, as well as my other responsibilities as critic for the treasury board and Management Board, it's my pleasure today to begin the debate on Bill 138, which is entitled An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

I found it interesting that during his comments the parliamentary assistant made the case that now was a good time to be debating this bill. I'd like to point out to those who are paying attention that this bill was tabled

for first reading in December 1993 and it was tabled to implement the budget commitment from the NDP Bob Rae government. That budget had been tabled in May 1993. So what we are actually doing today is debating for second reading, which is debate in principle, a tax bill that has been in effect for one year, and the parliamentary assistant says that's a good thing because people have now had a chance to see what the effect of the legislation is.

I would take issue with that. I don't think it's a good idea to be debating fait accompli legislation. I don't think retroactive legislation is a very good idea, although retroactive tax legislation is sometimes, and usually, a fact of life simply because it is implemented on the day of the budget and then the legislation is retroactive to that date. That's one of the traditions. Tax legislation is one of the few pieces of legislation we have accepted as part of our tradition of retroactive legislation.

The question, however, is the obligation of the government and of the Treasurer to move as expeditiously as possible to deal with legislation which by its very nature will be retroactive. In that case, the government gets a failing grade, because it should not take a year to deal with a piece of tax legislation. The reason it shouldn't take a year to deal with that legislation is that the debate here in the Legislature gives us the opportunity to explain to people what's going on, to have some real and serious debate about the effects of this legislation and to also perhaps point out some of the alternatives to this approach.

On the point that the parliamentary assistant made on the effect of this legislation, this, as well as the other tax moves contained in the budget of last spring, 1993, effectively raised taxes in this province by \$3 billion, but the net effect has been to see a decline in revenue of \$2 billion. What we know is happening as a result of the NDP fiscal and economic policy is to see a decline in consumer confidence, a decline in investor confidence, bankruptcies and job losses which have resulted overall. As the government desperately tries to increase its revenues, we have seen a decline overall in the revenue of this province by \$2 billion.

That is extremely serious and that is one of the primary examples and reasons why I make the argument—and I have made it before in this House and I will make it again today—that the economic and fiscal policy of the government is misguided and that tax increases which they brought forward in last year's budget were misguided and did not have the desired effect.

1530

The government's desired effect was to increase its revenues. The actual effect was to see revenues continue to decrease and revenues to decline; and further, we know because of the important work that was done at the finance and economics committee of the Legislature that the result has also been a very substantial increase in the participation of the underground economy.

I'd like to put on the record today, as we begin the debate on Bill 138, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, some of the comments that were made at the time of the 1993 budget, both those who gave advice before the

budget and those who gave advice following the budget. The reason I want to do that is that I don't think their advice has changed. In fact, some of their words have been prophetic, and if they were able to stand in this House today they would probably say, "We told you so." The people I'm referring to are leading economists, leading experts in the business community and people who watch the effect of governments' budgets.

The first I would like to refer to was part of an address by the chairman and chief executive officer of the Bank of Montreal, Matthew W. Barrett. I'm not going to read the whole address; that's not my intent. I just want to highlight what he had to say about taxation. He said:

"Our [tax] burden is more than 20% higher than in the United States—a market that now buys 25% of every single thing that is produced in this country. Raising [taxes] still higher would place the whole Canadian economy at a worse cost disadvantage in the American market. So for me, a further increase in our tax burden could make our problem of competitiveness more severe, which in turn would mean that higher taxes would not help us to reduce our deficits."

That was on page 4 of the chairman's address from the Bank of Montreal. The date was January 18, 1993, and we know his words have been prophetic and that he was right. I place that as evidence that the government didn't listen, in its vast pre-budget consultations, in its meetings and discussions with those people who knew what the impact of additional tax increases would be on the provincial economy, people who said to this government: "For every \$40,000 you take out of the economy in new taxes, you kill a job. For every percentage point you increase the taxes of the province of Ontario, you affect our competitiveness in dealing with our closest trading partner, the United States."

We know this government has not met its deficit targets. We know they are off this year, by their own predictions, by some \$2 billion above the \$6.8 billion that was part of their deficit reduction plan. We've been told to expect something in the \$8-billion range instead of the \$6.8-billion range. And we know the effect of that inability to manage the economy has created a lack of confidence by the business community and consumers alike in the province of Ontario.

I said I would place on the record some quotes from others on the 1993 budget. This is a quote from Mr Warren Jestin, chief economist of the Bank of Nova Scotia:

"Ontario's fiscal fitness program must not be a taxing exercise. Provincial spending trends are massively out of line with revenue realities. A strict multi-year expenditure diet is the only way to slim down our huge deficit without undermining local competitiveness."

Another quote, which is particularly significant for me because it will also allow me some editorial comment—and yes, I will repeat some of the things that I've said here in the House before—is from John Bulloch, president of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business: "If sensible restraint had been practised at the outset of the recession, the cuts necessary today wouldn't be as deep. It is high time to attack the expenditure side of the



ledger in a meaningful way and free up small business to do what they do best—create jobs.”

In his quote Mr Bulloch points out, “If sensible restraint had been practised at the outset of the recession.” I want to put on the record what I believe he means by that. In the budget that was tabled in this Legislature in the spring of 1990, the province’s expenditure plan for the year 1990-91 was an estimated 6.8%. The government changed, as we know, in September 1990, and by the end of that fiscal year of 1990-91 the NDP had increased spending to 14%. They had increased wages, which had a ripple effect through the entire economy of the province, those increases in the public sector to civil servants and broader public sector workers. In the second year, in their budget of 1991-92, the NDP presented a 12% spending increase. That was their fiscal plan.

The combination of a 14% increase for 1990-91 and a 12% increase in 1991-92 at the beginning of the worst recession in decades in this province and in this country left Ontario vulnerable and created huge deficits. We have seen our debt tripled in just three years. We know it was that misguided fiscal and economic planning by the provincial government under Bob Rae and the NDP that made the recession we’ve faced, that made the fiscal and economic position of the province, very precarious.

We have seen three downgradings from the rating agencies. In September 1990 Bob Rae and his NDP government, Floyd Laughren, Finance minister, inherited a AAA credit rating. Ontario’s credit rating since that point in time has been downgraded three times: first, to AA-plus; then to AA; and now AA-minus. That is a direct result of the economic mismanagement of Bob Rae’s government.

Back to the quotes of what people were telling this government about its budget in 1993. Pat Palmer, president of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, said this about tax increases: “Tax increases will only make the deficit position worse and subsequently put even more pressure on our social programs.”

Alasdair McKichan, president of the Retail Council of Canada, said this: “The recovery is extremely fragile and any tax increases which affect the consumer’s disposable income could have a chilling effect on consumer spending.” That relates directly to Bill 138, and we’ll be discussing that further in a moment.

This is what Maureen Farrow, chief economist for Coopers and Lybrand, had to say:

“It is imperative that Minister Laughren firmly addresses the mounting Ontario debt load in order to see the province on the path of regaining fiscal flexibility. This requires clear, honest communications to Ontarians; realistic assessment of economic perspectives and revenue projections; and firm resolve to set about redesigning the operation of government and the delivery of programs.”

1540

That quote speaks volumes. The reason I say that speaks volumes is because we know that under the NDP government our debt load has tripled. We know that for the first time in the history of this province, the Provin-

cial Auditor refused to attest to the books of the province of Ontario and has criticized the lack of adherence to generally accepted accounting principles by this government. We know that Bob Rae and the NDP have been tinkering at the edges with their so-called social contract rather than looking at real redesign and the real reform and restructuring required of government itself.

Leo de Bever, chief economist of Nomura Canada Inc, said this: “The Rae government has realized that it cannot finance its original agenda and that it has little choice but to manage its way out of the deficit problem it refused to recognize two years ago.”

He said that in 1993. Mr de Bever knows that when you inherited the government in the fall of 1990, along with that AAA credit rating, you inherited a spending plan of 6.8%. By running up government expenditures, by adding fuel to the government expenditure plan to take it up to 14% in the first year and 12% in the second year, those two years created an economic situation in this province that the taxpayers, the citizens of Ontario have paid a very, very high price for.

The Ontario Natural Gas Association said this: “The 1993 Ontario budget should neither increase taxes nor the deficit. A net tax increase would damage economic prospects.... A deficit increase...would be bad for the economy and would be unfair to future generations.”

We know that in spite of this advice, in spite of the advice from the institutions and the people I just quoted, that’s exactly what the government did. They did not meet their deficit reductions, as they had proposed, and they increased taxes, and Bill 138 is the example of tax increases.

There are a few other quotes I would like to put on the record, but I’m going to wait a few minutes. I’m going to first talk about the substance of Bill 138, because I think it alone speaks for itself about why Bill 138 is the wrong legislation for this time in Ontario, just as it was the wrong legislation for last December, when it was tabled, and it was the wrong legislation when it was announced in the budget almost a year ago.

The tax structures in the province of Ontario—and they are substantive. During buoyant economic times—actually, some refer to them as the good old days of 1985 to 1990, when the economy was booming and 700,000 jobs were created. We know that during that time there were tax increases. Nobody likes tax increases, but most people will agree that it is during the good times, the prosperous times, that you look at new programs or funding for existing programs.

When we inherited government in 1985, there was much to be done. While I don’t say that everything we did was perfect—certainly we were far from perfect—I am proud of the record of accomplishment of that government from 1985 to 1990.

The tax structure in Ontario, as I am about to speak about it, has had over the course of history, between the Conservatives, the Liberals and the NDP, three basic concepts for sales tax, and that’s what we’re talking about: retail sales tax. We have had taxes on personal property, we have had taxes on services, and we have had

taxes on admissions to movies and concerts and that sort of thing.

What Bill 138 represents is a whole new concept of taxation for the province. We have now a tax on insurance premiums and benefit plans. This is new. We have never seen this before, and therefore it is worthy and deserving of debate and discussion. Let me just clearly put on the record what this means, because it is complicated and there are some exemptions I'd like to place on the record as well.

What Bill 138 says is that Ontario residents or businesses purchasing new insurance policies after May 19, 1993, or renewing existing policies after June 30, 1993, are liable to pay 8% tax on premiums and 5% on automobile insurance policies. That is extremely significant, because what that says is that for the very first time on life insurance, home owners' insurance, all kinds of insurance policies and benefit packages, the province is collecting an 8% tax, and a 5% tax on auto insurance premiums.

Recently, with the discussion of graduated licensing, with the discussions we had on Bill 164, which was the amendment to the auto insurance regime of the province, we had the opportunity in my riding to ask people how they felt about auto insurance, how they thought the new system was working and how they felt about the cost of insurance in Ontario.

It was astounding, to me, the numbers of people who said they believed they were paying too much for their auto insurance. There were many people who felt that because auto insurance was a mandatory requirement for people driving a car in the province, mandatory by law, that the price should be as reasonable as possible and that the last thing—in fact, unanimously. I don't think there was one constituent who told me they felt a tax on auto insurance premiums could be justified—not one.

Certainly there were some people who said they would be willing to pay more for better benefits. There were a few. But most people said: "Look, times are tough. The economy is difficult. I'm worried that I may not have a job tomorrow. I need my car for business purposes and I want to keep my insurance rates as low as possible." Bill 138 says to them, "On top of all of the changes to Bill 164 and the costs of operating your vehicle, Bill 138 is going to increase your auto insurance by 5%."

When somebody said to me, "That's a long way from what Bob Rae promised, both on tax increases and on an auto insurance plan," I said to them: "I have no answer for you. I can't understand how Bob Rae, who participated so vigorously in the debate about auto insurance, he and his government now, former members of the opposition, who understood how significant the issue of price was and is to consumers in Ontario, who are forced to have car insurance—I can't understand why they would have brought in a tax on auto insurance."

Bill 138 is quite a complex piece of legislation, but it adds, as I said, a new kind of tax, this tax on insurance policies. There are some exemptions, and I think they should be on the record just so that people who may not be aware will know what the government has chosen to exempt. I'm just going to read out the list of exemptions

from the ministry's very extensive briefing book. I very much appreciated the work that went into producing the book. It was extremely helpful, and I know that it will be well received by the people who are watching this to know how clearly the exemptions have been laid out.

#### 1550

The exemption from tax on insurance policies is reinsurance. For those people who don't know what reinsurance is, it's effectively when an insurance company has another insurance company share the risk with it. That's a reinsurance company. So what that really does is make sure that the tax is only paid once and you don't get the reinsurance company paying a tax for insurance that has already had the tax paid on it. That's a very good exemption, in my view.

Insurance on agricultural property used by a farmer—for example, a farmer's house and tractors or equipment or that sort of thing—is exempted from this legislation on insurance.

I think that small business people, in fact big business people could argue that they too, particularly during these difficult economic times, have to insure their business machinery and that they should be entitled to the same kind of an exemption. I see that as a glaring omission from this legislation.

Insurance policies, individual policies for life, health, physical wellbeing of insured individuals: That is consistent with what I said a few minutes ago when I said life insurance policies were covered. Life insurance policies are now taxable if they are a benefit from your employer, but if you purchase one by yourself as an individual, as an independent, you do not have to pay the tax. I'm curious as to the government's thinking. However, to me, this ultimately becomes a tax on people who work, it is an additional expense of employers and, further, I think it will result in employers offering fewer benefits.

So what happens is this tax is going to—in the medium term, because I think it's going to happen fairly quickly—you will see employers reducing their benefit packages as the cost of insurance increases or they will say to their employees, "Where before we paid the whole thing, now you, employee, will have to share the cost of the benefit package." I think that this was originally seen by a lot of people as a tax on business, but in fact it is not. It is the workers and the individuals who are going to suffer because of this tax.

Another exemption from this legislation is marine insurance on exempt vehicles. If you have an exempt vehicle then you are exempted, and if you don't have an exempt vehicle you are not exempted.

Another one is the insurance on exempt aircraft; insurance on Indians residing on a reserve or property situated on a reserve; annuity contracts and sureties; insurance entered into by an employer in respect to employees who ordinarily work outside Ontario or former employees no longer resident in Ontario. That was a little complicated, and perhaps if the parliamentary assistant, when he has the opportunity to sum up—some of these exemptions, I think, do need explaining. Insurance carried by an employer with respect to employees who ordinarily



work outside Ontario or who are no longer residents of Ontario, I think is an interesting and curious exemption, because it seems to me that if you're going to exempt employees outside Ontario you should also exempt employees in Ontario. Of course if you exempted employees in Ontario you'd have to scrap your bill, and that would be a good thing.

The last exemption is insurance on individuals not resident in Ontario or property or risks wholly outside Ontario. That one is self-explanatory, although as I differentiate between the two exemptions I did question the government's thinking.

Probably the most insidious part of Bill 138 is its tax on benefit plans, and I'd like to just spend a couple of minutes putting on the record what the ministry itself says about these plans:

"Ontario resident plan holders who provide benefit plans are liable to pay 8% tax on premiums payable by the plan holder."

In simple language, plan holders are usually employers. These are group benefit plans. So the plan holder is the employer, and this says the employer has to pay an 8% tax on the premiums for the benefit package for their employee. What that means is that those benefit plans are going to cost 8% more.

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** Only 5%.

**Mrs Caplan:** I see the member for Chatham-Kent saying it's only 5%. In fact, it is 8% except in the case of auto insurance.

I want to be really clear. This legislation increases the cost of employer—which are employee benefit plans—employer-owned—they are the plan holder but they hold them on behalf of their employees, and it is the employees who benefit from these benefit plans. I'll give you some examples of what they are.

A benefit plan could be for extended medical; a benefit plan could be a drug plan; a benefit plan could provide eyeglasses and assistive devices; a benefit plan could provide for private coverage, and we know that they're all different. A benefit plan, for example, could also be and often is long-term disability insurance, and a benefit plan would include life insurance: all of those things which employers negotiate or give to their employees, frequently in lieu of wage increases and sometimes because it is a priority for the worker or the workers.

We know that the union movement in Ontario and around the world has been very successful in negotiating important extended benefit plans for their employees, and that many non-unionized employers have been very progressive in providing very good benefit packages to their employees. All of those benefit packages now increase the cost of doing business because those benefit packages are 8% more expensive than they were before Bill 138.

I'm surprised the member for Durham East is laughing.

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** You brought in health tax so that everyone would be covered in an automobile accident; that's what you said.

**Mrs Caplan:** The member across refers to the employer health tax. I want to tell him what the employer

health tax did. The employer health tax removed OHIP premiums. It eliminated all OHIP premiums. It was a \$1-billion tax cut to individuals. It was designed in such a way that any business that was providing full OHIP coverage to their employees should not have seen any increase in cost, and it created a level playing field among businesses. That was done at a time of a buoyant and booming economy.

I would agree that payroll taxes and taxes on business hurt. They hurt in job creation and they particularly hurt in times of recession, but at the time the employer health tax was brought in, Ontario's economy led the western world. Ontario was seeing thousands of jobs being created, and the people of Ontario appreciated the fact that they no longer had to pay OHIP premiums and they could have the kind of access to health care unencumbered by the cost of a premium that was inefficient to collect and was unfair because some employers paid and others did not.

It is a very different discussion and a very different argument than the argument of Bill 138, which then says to the good employers who have those benefit packages for their employees, "We're going to make sure that those plans are now 8% more expensive."

1600

Do you know what those employers' responses are going to be, those employers and those businesses that are attempting to do everything they can to stay competitive, attempting to do everything they can to stay in business and offer employment to their employees? When they are looking at places to save money, they are going to either have to say to their employees, "You have to share the cost of these benefit plans," or they're going to say, "We're going to have to reduce, or get out of entirely, benefit packages," and that would be a sad day in Ontario, given the history we have had and how important benefit packages are to employees across this province.

On new benefit plans entered into after May 19, 1993, the tax is payable from that date. So when this legislation came in, immediately all benefit plans will pay 8%. For existing plans where there were no changes in the terms or conditions, the tax was payable as of June 30, 1993. Six weeks after the Treasurer tabled his budget, businesses were taxed an additional 8% on the cost of their benefit packages.

Mr Speaker, if you don't think that had a negative impact on business confidence in this province—well, I shouldn't say "if you don't think" because that's a rhetorical question. I know, Mr Speaker, that you know that the tax on premiums on employee benefits that came in in the budget of 1993 sent a chilling effect through the business community in Ontario. I know you know that, and I don't understand why the NDP just didn't get it.

Bill 138 says a benefit plan is a plan that gives protection against risk to an individual that could otherwise be obtained through insurance. Such plans would typically cover payment on death or disability, supplement health care, drugs, dental care, vision care, hearing care or protection from loss of income due to illness or accident.

What's interesting about this definition, and I mentioned it just a few moments ago, is that where an employer self-insures and doesn't go out and purchase the plan but offers this benefit to their employee, the tax applies.

A plan is a funded benefit plan if the amounts paid into the fund exceed expected payable benefits payable by the fund within the following 30 days, and that taxable premium payable for a funded benefit plan is the amount paid into the plan by the plan holder less the amounts paid to the plan holder by members to receive benefits under the plan plus the amounts paid by members to receive the benefits under the plan.

What's really interesting about this is that this clearly defines what happens when an employer self-insures. It defines what a plan is, and it's very clear that they were attempting to close any loophole that might give any flexibility. Bill 138 is what I would call a stranglehold on benefit plans. It taxes all benefit plans whether or not the employer self-insures or purchases a plan, but it doesn't tax the employer alone, because ultimately the tax on benefit plans is a tax on jobs and a tax on workers.

I'm not going to go through all of the various briefing notes from the ministry. I've just tried to pick out some highlights. I'm going to leave benefit plans for a moment. One of the things the bill did that quite frankly surprised me is the tax on parking charges.

I remember when the government tabled an act to repeal the corporate concentration tax act. I remember it very well, because they included in that act "and other matters." It was one of the sneakiest pieces of legislation ever to hit the floor of this Legislature because it included all kinds of amendments to health legislation and drug plans. Once everybody found out what it was that the government was doing, some people said that what it was doing was sleazy; others said that what it was doing was pernicious.

The good part of that legislation was the repeal of the corporate concentration tax. Let me just say for the member from Durham East, who's going back to his seat, who's probably going to shout out that, along with the employer health tax, that was a tax that was brought in by the previous government: Yes, it was. But the corporate concentration tax was brought in at a time when Metropolitan Toronto's economy was not only booming; it was considered by many to be overheated and it was considered by many to be in need of some cooling off. The whole intent of the corporate concentration tax at that time was to moderate the kind of economic growth that we were seeing.

Certainly no one ever contemplated the devastating effect on the Metropolitan Toronto economy or the economy in the GTA as a result of the recession. That's fair comment. Nobody ever contemplated it. I remember all of the advice we were receiving was that Ontario may well avoid the recession. We heard that if anything it would be a soft landing. We heard that if it did go into recession, it likely would be short and shallow. We know that at the time the corporate concentration tax was brought in, the world was very different than the world today.

In hindsight, it's my view that the corporate concentration tax should have been repealed much earlier than the NDP government repealed it. In the face of the terrible recession that hit Ontario, the corporate concentration tax in my opinion should have come off the following year after it was brought in.

Why am I making that discussion about the corporate concentration tax when it's not before us, when we have had an act to repeal the corporate concentration tax? Bill 138 applies parking charges, which is what the corporate concentration tax did, not only in the greater Toronto area; it applies retail sales tax charges to all of the parking lots across the province. With one hand, this government stood up and said: "Aren't we wonderful? We're doing the right thing. We're repealing the corporate concentration act."

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** The commercial concentration tax, Elinor.

**Mrs Caplan:** I'm sorry. I'm rightly corrected. It was called the commercial concentration tax, not the corporate concentration tax. They said, "We are repealing the commercial concentration tax, but in its place we're bringing in Bill 138 and we're going to tax all parking lots across the province." That's Bill 138. So in fact you did not repeal the principle of the commercial concentration tax. All you did was repeal it for the greater Toronto area, then reimpose it across the whole province.

Mr Speaker, I have to tell you that it's very, very distressing to see these kinds of parking charges brought in. And what are they charging them on? Let me tell you what the ministry says. The ministry says, "Persons who, after June 30, 1993, pay to park their motor vehicles are liable to an 8% tax on the parking charge, including coins inserted in meter parking." Now, who runs meter parking? Municipalities. The municipalities, by and large, had two choices: They could up the parking rates or, as they would say, eat the tax and send the money back to the province.

1610

In effect, this parking tax had exactly the same impact on parking lots and parking rates as the tax called the commercial concentration tax that the government said it was repealing. The only difference between the two pieces of legislation is that the commercial concentration tax was on the basis of square footage and this is directly on all parking charges. Whatever you charge on parking, you're going to pay 8%, across the whole province.

There is an exemption to this and it's an important exemption. Exemptions from the tax are provided where residential tenants pay the landlord for at least 30 days, where the right to park is purchased by the owner of a condominium unit or co-op apartment, and where a resident purchases a municipal permit to park on a residential street.

I think that is a reasonable exemption. I think it's an important exemption. However, what it says is that if you live next door to the condominium and you want to purchase rental parking for a month, you pay the tax, but if you live in the building, you don't pay the tax. If you own an apartment, you don't pay the tax, but if you live



next door, you do. To me, that's not fair. It seems to me that if you're going to exempt parking contracts, you should exempt parking contracts for everyone who has a 30-day parking contract. That's not what the government did and, frankly, I don't think that's fair.

In the time I have remaining I want to touch on just a couple of the other features of the bill. I know some of my colleagues are going to speak as well and they will go into it in greater depth.

I describe Bill 138 as sort of being a tax that kind of nickel-and-dimes you. There is a tax not only on parking meters; there is also a tax on those people who produce their own beer and wine. In the immortal words of Bob Rae as Leader of the Opposition, "Give me a break," is the cry from the people who produce their own beer and wine.

That's a fair and legitimate request, because Bill 138 says that persons who on or after August 1 receive delivery of beer or wine they produce for their own consumption on commercial premises, not in their own home, are liable to a tax of 26 cents per litre. The tax increases to 31 cents per litre of beer or wine delivered to the taxpayer between June 14, 1994, and June 15, 1995, and to 38 cents a litre thereafter.

I'll tell you that this is really nickel-and-diming. When you hit people who make their own wine it just—no wonder people are frustrated, no wonder people are feeling overtaxed, when you see these kinds of what I would call nickel-and-dime taxes. They're out to get you for every nickel.

Exemption from these taxes: I think this is important. There are some exemptions. Parts and labour required to do repairs under service warranty or maintenance contracts will be subject to the tax effective May 20, 1993, except where the purchaser of the property being repaired would be exempt from tax on the purchase of parts, and the purchasers of soil, clay, sand, gravel and unfinished stone will be subject to the tax effective July 1, 1993. So when you go to buy some gravel for your driveway or some stone to fix up the patio, for the first time you're going to pay tax in the province of Ontario.

Probably one of the best provisions in this act, because I think it's the sort of tax that was initially designed to raise a pool of capital that would be available for research and development, so that the problem of old tires could be dealt with in the province of Ontario, Bill 138 does repeal. It says the tax of \$5 on the purchase of new tires is repealed effective May 20, 1993. As someone who was part of the government that brought in the tire tax, the initial intent of the tire tax was twofold: One, it was to create, as I said, a pool of money so that you could find a solution to what to do with old tires because you didn't want them going into the dump, and the money—

**Mr Hope:** Why did it go into general revenues?

**Mrs Caplan:** I have a question from the member for Chatham-Kent and I'm happy to answer that. He says, "Why did it go into general revenues?" In fact, the way the government has always run under the Tories, under the Liberals and under the NDP is that all revenues

collected go into the pot. You can keep track, and the government does, in what's called a "notional fund" of how much has been collected.

However, when funds are allocated they're allocated from the consolidated revenue fund. That's why it's called "consolidated revenue fund." All the money goes in, all the allocation is made from there, but you are still able, under that consolidated revenue fund, to keep track of what moneys come in from what sources, and they do keep track.

Once a sufficient pool of money was collected from the tire tax that could fund the kind of research and development that would solve the problem, it was reasonable that the tire tax be abolished. Mostly it was a nuisance and bothered a lot of people. I don't think people realize what a big problem disposal of tires is.

We had the big fire in Hagersville. Those tires are still sitting there; they haven't been dealt with. I guess my frustration and the point I want to make at the time we are repealing the tire tax is that this government has had four years. It has had the revenue from the tire tax and it still hasn't solved the problem. I would say to you that this is a sad and sorry tale of mismanagement and incompetence, because you've had the resources coming in.

I'm assuming, since you are cancelling the tire tax, that there are sufficient resources available to do the research and development and that you will be very shortly announcing the solution to what to do with old tires. I look forward to that announcement, because the only way that we are going to protect the environment in this province is if we find solutions to environmental problems. Old tires are an environmental problem, they are a hazard and we must have a solution for them.

While I would very much like to support that portion of this act which repeals the tire tax, I'm sorry they didn't put it into a separate act, because the repeal of the tire tax is something which I think we could have a discussion and debate about. The problem of excess tires is one which is still with us today, and I would very much like to support the repeal of the tire tax at this time. It's my view that enough revenue has been generated to solve the problem, and I believe that this is a time when Ontario needs fewer taxes, not more taxes. I think it's a time at least to hold the line on taxes while we get our fiscal house in order, while we recover from the annual \$10-billion deficits. These guys are going to come forward in a couple of months with a projected \$8-billion deficit for the coming year and they're going to say, "See the progress we've made."

That's just not good enough. The people of the province of Ontario are not feeling confident in the government. They know where the responsibility lies, they know who have been the economic and fiscal managers over the last four years and they are very disappointed.

I'd like to conclude my remarks first with some quotes on the 1993 budget and on Bill 138, and then lastly I would like to do what the member asked, and that is to discuss alternatives and a fiscal plan for the province instead of Bill 138, because I believe that part of the responsibility of an effective opposition is to propose alternatives.

1620

I'd like to quote again, Jack MacDonald, Hamilton Spectator, May 20, 1993, the day after the budget. He said: "Many of the acts of Bob Rae's government seem to be based on blind faith. Like Peter Pan, if I think good thoughts, anything can happen. Almost every act has resulted in it landing on its head and Ontario must feel the pain."

A quote from Elizabeth Payne in the Ottawa Citizen, "New taxes on such items as sand and gravel led one observer to quip that Laughren placed a tax on dirt and still couldn't balance his budget."

This is from Richard Brennan, Windsor Star, and I think he is quoting Pat Palmer, president of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, in this quote:

"We're outraged. This kind of tax grab is unconscionable and we believe the people of Ontario should have an opportunity to tell the government just how far out of touch this taxation policy is. As a result of this budget, almost every working person in the province will have a smaller paycheque and higher costs and there is very little to help the unemployed start earning paycheques."

Linda Leatherdale from the Toronto Sun, May 16:—

*Interjections.*

**Mrs Caplan:** I know you're going to like this one. It was in her column, but she is quoting John Strick, University of Windsor economist, and I quote, "'No country can afford to have its tax system too far out of line with its neighbours before it loses investment and jobs to other low-tax competitors.'" That was John Strick, University of Windsor economist.

The last quote—well, it's not the last; I have a few others I'd like to place—

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** We're being selective there, aren't we?

**Mrs Caplan:** No, I'm not being selective. These quotes are available in the editorial from the Financial Post, May 11, 1993: "Higher taxes reduce incentive, increase tax avoidance, and encourage the movement of business and assets out of the jurisdiction that raises the taxes."

I think that says it all, so I'm going to—

*Interjections.*

**Mrs Caplan:** I hear the hooting and hollering from across the other side. Pay attention. This is an editorial from the Financial Post and this is what you should learn if you want to understand fiscal and economic policy. Listen: "Higher taxes reduce incentive, increase tax avoidance and encourage the movement of business and assets out of the jurisdiction that raises the taxes."

The world has changed. Certainly the world has changed far more than any of us can imagine. When I arrived in this Legislature in 1985, Ontario was at the beginning of an unprecedented economic boom. When I arrived in this Legislature in 1985, the province had inherited an operating deficit from the Conservative government. When I served here through 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988 and 1990, the years of the Liberal government, I was proud of the fact that by 1987 we had

managed a balanced operating budget and maintained that operating budget until the government changed in 1990.

Further, in the year 1989-90 we achieved for the first time in 40 years a fully balanced budget, including both operating and capital, and further paid down almost a half a billion dollars on the province's debt. Those facts are true. They are available in the reports of the Ministry of Finance and in the budget statements. That is an economic record of which I am proud.

And I can tell you, yes, the world has changed. We know the government frequently says: "What would you have done? What would you do instead?" The first thing I want to tell the parliamentary assistant in answer to that question is that in 1990-91 we would have had the budget plan that we brought forward in the spring of 1990 that called for a 6.8% expenditure plan. We would not have driven spending in the province to 14%.

Anyone who looks at the expenditure plans would see a steady decline in the last three years, between 1987, 1988 and 1989. There had been a decline in spending, and it is fair to say that decline would have continued. But that's hindsight, and that's always the clearest vision of all: They say hindsight is 20-20.

I would commend the members for the Liberal minority report from the economic and finance committee, where we give the government very good advice on what it should do in this year's budget. What we suggest to them is prudent, sensible economic and fiscal policy. We say, "Do not raise taxes." We say, "Do not at this time risk the fragile economy in the province of Ontario through budget increases."

We believe there are significant opportunities for the government to reinvent itself. We believe—we know—the time has come, because of the serious economic recession of the last four years, for government to look at every activity and ask itself what it is doing. Is the service of any value to anyone? Could the service be better provided by someone else? And, if government should be providing the service, is there a better way to provide that service?

With that kind of attitude and an open mind, rather than sending out anti-business, anti-private sector messages, whether it is to home care or child care, whether it is to labs or anyone else delivering an important public service, the province of Ontario instead could say: "Not only is Ontario open for business, but Ontario is open to the kinds of ideas that the ideology of the New Democrats does not permit. We are open to making sure that the taxpayers of Ontario can receive the very best possible, highest-quality services. We are open to achieving the delivery of those services in the most effective and efficient manner that new technologies will permit. We believe government should be a good employer but should have the ability to work with its employees to find better ways, through re-engineering strategies, through a number of management tools that are available to a competent business, of delivering services in a more cost-effective and more streamlined manner, better services that cost less."

This isn't new. We've seen experiences in the private sector and in other jurisdictions. We actually have seen



some very small first steps and examples within government.

It seems to me that if a government wants advice—and I give this advice—it is important to open our minds to public and private sector partnerships so the government can learn from the private sector and find new and better ways of delivering the important services to the people of the province of Ontario, but to do it in a way which is more affordable for the taxpayer. Bill 138 does not accomplish any of that.

1630

The only part of Bill 138 that is supportable is the repeal of the tire tax, but because it is coupled with so many tax increases—an increase on premiums and benefits, an increase on parking charges, an increase on sand and gravel—Bill 138 is not worthy of support in this Legislature. On behalf of the constituents in the riding of Oriole, whom I've had the opportunity to serve since 1985, I will not be supporting Bill 138.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Questions or comments?

**Mrs Marland:** As someone else who also was elected in 1985, I wish had an hour and a half or two hours to respond to this particular member's comments. Although I'm not one of the principal speakers on Bill 138 today and I do only have two minutes at this point to make a rebuttal comment, I probably could have accepted some of the comments having just been made by anyone else in this House but someone who was a member of the cabinet of the Liberal government, which brought in more new taxes than any government in the history of this province, particularly the kinds of taxes that were a deterrent rather than an incentive to a solution.

At the time the tire tax came in, I was the Environment critic, along with Mrs Ruth Grier, who was the Environment critic for the NDP. This was a big panic reaction by the Liberal government to the Hagersville tire fire. If there was anything that was scandalous, it was the way the tire tax money was spent: whoosh, sucked right into the general revenue fund, in excess of \$100 million a year. Perhaps at the end of the first year, \$5 million to \$8 million had been allocated in researching safe disposal methods or reuse and recycling of used tires. That was just one part of one of the taxes that government stands on as its record.

I have a great deal of opposition to this bill. I have people in my own community who are being put out of business: the brew-your-own facilities and the people who are being impacted, obviously, by the insurance tax and the warranty and service and parts tax. This is an outrageous bill, coming at the worst time for the people in this province and the people in Mississauga South.

**Mr Sutherland:** The member for Oriole raised quite a few different points that, obviously, in two minutes I don't have an opportunity to respond to, but I want to try and respond to a few of them anyway.

The tax on brew-your-own beer is an interesting discussion and debate. At one point, the people were arguing, "Well, I'm producing my own beer," but you have to remember, you're producing it on a commercial property. All we've done in this legislation is make the

tax rate the same there as it is in some establishments that brew their own beer for purposes of making retail sales. People need to keep that in mind, that that's what we've done, that we've in effect made a level playing field here in terms of those types of services.

I was really interested in the comment from the member for Oriole about what her party's options were: "Don't be anti-business. Promote investment. Reinvent government. Re-engineer government." There are no specifics. They don't know. They talk in general, fuzzy platitudes: "We'll do this." The people of Ontario want to know where they really stand. I suspect that "reinvent government, reorganize government, re-engineer" are code words. What they are is code words for significant layoffs.

There's no doubt government has to change, and it is changing under the leadership of Bob Rae and this government. It's changing in a way of working in partnership with employees to ensure job security. But the Liberals haven't said anything about that. If you listen very closely, it sounds very clear to me that because the Tories are going over to where the Reform Party is, the Liberal Party wants to move to where the Tories were. I heard a lot of code words there that the Liberals are saying, "We're going to do dramatic layoffs if we get elected next time."

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I hope I don't need two minutes to respond to the member for Oriole's speech, but I listened quite closely to what she said. If you listened to her very closely, you heard that she is against higher taxes—against high taxes, period. She sounded like a Mike Harris Conservative, in my opinion. She spoke very strongly and very fervently against higher taxes. I was pleased, because I support her in that initiative, and certainly I'm against this bill as well.

She also indicated that for every \$40,000 increase in taxes, one job is lost, if I'm correct; I think that's what she said. That's a figure that is used commonly in this place. I also think lower taxes are the answer to job creation. But I wonder. The member for Oriole has spent a great deal of time being rather less than charitable to the opinions of our leader, the member for Nipissing. From time to time, she's taken fairly nasty shots at him in this House.

I'd like to read the response our party made to Ontario budget of 1988. Remember that budget? At that time, the member for Nipissing of course was the finance critic for the Conservative caucus, that small caucus of 16 members. Frankly, if they'd been listened to at that time, we wouldn't have half the problems we have today. Madam Speaker, I know you agree with that. The headline was, "Liberal Tax Grab Doesn't Wash."

"An unprecedented \$1.2-billion budget tax grab by Ontario Liberals is fuelled by little more than out-of-control spending, says PC finance critic Mike Harris."

It goes on to quote Mr Harris as saying: "Ontario's spirited economic growth presented the government with an opportunity to address spending priorities without tax hikes. Instead, failure by the Liberals to implement sound fiscal management is penalizing those responsible for creating this growth and all the jobs."

We all know that if taxes negatively impact on job growth, lower taxes in 1988 would have positively impacted on job growth. I would just like to ask the member for Oriole, does she agree now with Mike Harris?

**Mr Mills:** I listened to the member for Oriole, and I'm of the opinion that she's got as much likelihood of understanding what Bill 138 is all about as Donald Duck has of winning Mastermind.

Having said that, I find it absolutely galling that the member can stand in her place and talk about taxes, when she was a member of the Liberal cabinet that introduced a record 33 tax increases when money was flowing out of their ears. Everywhere they turned, they had money, but they insisted on taxing the people of Ontario to death.

It begs this question: If things in Ontario were so wonderful and rosy, doesn't it make you wonder why they called an election in 1990? They had the biggest majority you could ever think of, but they still called an election. I think the people of Ontario called their bluff. When they turned around and tried to knock one percentage point off the sales tax when they knew they were going down the tubes, the people saw their cynical move very, very quickly and they booted them out of office for their manipulation, or their attempted manipulation, of the public and the people of Ontario.

When they were in power, they manipulated the people of Ontario in the most awful way with these little taxes. And then they played into the insurance companies' hands: They introduced the health tax so that they could let the insurance companies off the hook, because people had to go and use that for their care and the insurance companies didn't have to pay. No wonder the insurance companies endorsed the Liberals. No wonder they gave hundreds of thousands of dollars to their campaign, which fortunately they lost.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** The member for Oriole has two minutes to reply.

**Mrs Caplan:** I'm not going to engage in the kind of rhetoric we've heard in the last couple of minutes. In summing up on Bill 138, the point I would make once again is that I acknowledge that the world has changed. The world in 1994 is not the world of 1988, 1989, 1990; I admit that. I'm sorry it took Bob Rae and the NDP so long to wake up to the need for the kind of fiscal responsibility and see the fiscal reality that faces the province. Ontarians have suffered. In my view, they've suffered in a way which was worse than anyone ever contemplated, simply because of the economic and fiscal policies.

1640

To the Conservatives, who made a point in their response to what I had to say regarding the tire tax, I'd point out to Mrs Marland that never in the history of Conservative governments in the province of Ontario was there ever a designated tax—was there ever a separate pool. All funds ever collected in the history of the province always went into the consolidated revenue fund, and for Mrs Marland to stand and rant and rave and suggest that this was in some way abnormal is just clearly not the facts.

The reality is that the accounting has always been kept separate, historically and traditionally, in the province, from all governments, but all resources go into the consolidated revenue fund and at best you will see a notional fund created. The Tories did that with Wintario, and we believed when we formed the government that we'd find this big fund of lottery money awaiting us. Nothing could be further from the truth. It had all gone into the consolidated revenue fund, even though by law they were designated to set up a separate fund for the purposes of sports, culture and recreation. So let's cut the game-playing and let's get on with improving the lot for the people of the province of Ontario—

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired.

**Mrs Caplan:** —by holding the line and defeating this bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mrs Marland:** I have a point of order on another matter: The matter that I wish to draw to the attention of the Chair is dealing with respect for the institution of Parliament and this hallowed House. Earlier today, it was observed that we had an elected member in the House attend here wearing jeans, no jacket, no tie and an open, short-sleeved jean shirt. I simply say to that member—I will not name the member; the member knows who he is; he is a member of the government benches. I think it's regrettable when this House is not shown the respect for the institution that it is and all of us—I know we do not have a requirement for a clothing or dress code, but I think it's important that this place be maintained with the respect that it is due. I would ask those members who choose to dress inappropriately in anybody's opinion, simply that—jeans actually are more expensive than regular clothing. There's no excuse for it.

**The Acting Speaker:** I thank the member for bringing that to my attention. It is not in fact a point of order, but I do thank her. Further debate? The member for Markham.

**Mr Cousens:** For people who are watching this show on TV, it has to be one of the worst kinds of entertainment they could pick. Certainly, to talk about taxes is a subject that we in the Legislature spend far too much time talking about, because there have been some 65 taxes brought in in the last 10 years, between the Liberals and the New Democrats. Taxation is one of the larger subjects that we concentrate on here in this House.

Some of the things that have been said this afternoon—the member for Mississauga South has been put down in a most unfair way by the member for Oriole. I think we should remember the fact that there have been designated taxes in the past and those taxes—they haven't been all-encompassing, but there have been specific taxes in the past, in particular as it affected the Ministry of Natural Resources, where it had some specific taxes for water and the lake systems.

The fact of the matter is, as a fisherman, I know in the House I'm on record when we brought in the new tax—it isn't a tax; it's a licence for fishing in Ontario—I would have been far happier if that had been designated not to the general revenue fund but into stocking rivers and



lakes and just for creating more fish stocks in the province. That would have been another example where I would have felt that my licence, which is a tax, was going to a cause that I would have agreed with; that is, stocking our supply of fish.

Taxation is our subject today and I find it so laughable; in fact, I've been sitting here chuckling away. The member for Oriole, who speaks out against this bill—I'm sorry, I'm going to have to do it.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Are you going to say something about the previous Liberal administration?

**Mr Cousens:** I am going to be talking about the previous Liberal administration—

**Mr Sorbara:** Oh, Donald, give it a rest.

**Mr Cousens:** —and in particular I'm going to be talking about their tire tax. It's just an incredible experience to sit here and listen to the member for Oriole berating the government on the tire tax and how the money wasn't spent and how so much was collected.

But you know, the funny thing is that this came in in 1989 when Bob Nixon was the Treasurer. I'm going to refer to some of the comments in the Legislature at that time, and especially when the Minister of Revenue, then the Honourable Ben Grandmaître, was defending it for what purposes it had.

What happens, though, when you're dealing with taxation—if you're in government, you have one view, and the government's is: "Well, we're going to need some money. We've got all these"—

**Mr Sorbara:** If it moves, tax it.

**Mr Cousens:** I agree with the member from York Centre: If it moves, tax it.

**Mr Sorbara:** This government believes, "If it moves, tax it; if it doesn't move, oh well, tax it anyway."

**Mr Cousens:** Never mind. You'll have your turn.

**Mr Sorbara:** I am not going to let you get into this Liberal-bashing today.

**Mr Cousens:** I don't want to start quoting a Liberal Greg Sorbara in a good Conservative speech that is about to come out here. I have to get warmed up, though, so I'm leaving it.

The government has one view of taxes—

**Mr Sorbara:** You have not been warmed up in about a decade.

**The Acting Speaker:** Interjections are out of order.

**Mr Mills:** He could never get warmed up.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member, go ahead.  
*Interjections.*

**Mr Cousens:** I defer to you, Madam Speaker. You obviously don't have any control over Mr Sorbara. Who does? He doesn't know how to control himself.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member should address his remarks through the Chair.

**Mr Cousens:** The issue has to do with taxes. If you're in government, you have a sense, "We need more money." They don't stop and think how they can reduce

the size of government, how they can be more efficient with the resources they have, how they can develop an economy that's going to generate more tax revenue through having an environment where business is thriving and therefore adding to the tax. But somehow there's a spirit that comes over government that says, "We need more money; it'll be through taxation."

With Mr Rae and Mr Laughren, since they've taken power of the province on September 6, 1990—what a dreadful day that was—they have taken this government into more taxation and collecting of more money, but at the same time spending more money. So when you're talking about taxation when you're in government, taxation is something you just have to do.

They don't know how to balance both sides: the taxation side with reduced spending, reduced expectations, being honest with yourself. When you're in government, it seems to be the case that the government has a sense of greed and want and feeding the system, instead of—

**Mr Mills:** You should know.

**Mr Cousens:** I'm saying this as one in opposition. When you're in opposition, it seems so easy to stand up and criticize and tear apart and to just berate everything the government is doing. I think there is something dreadfully wrong with our whole parliamentary system that we are into the constant clash; where government does something, and just because it did it, it's wrong, and the opposition therefore automatically has to stand up and criticize it.

I somehow would like to see a balance, because what I'm leaning towards is that in this bill—

**Mr Mills:** Do I sense a conversion on the road to Damascus?

**Mr Cousens:** There are parts of this bill that I agree with, and I want to come out and support that and spend some time talking about it, and there are parts of the bill that I don't agree with. I think what we really want to bring to the Legislative Assembly is this kind of fairness in thinking, rather than standing up, as the member for Oriole just did, whose government brought in the tire tax, and now, just a few years later, condemning the government for almost removing it. There's such an inconsistency in the logic and the position of the member in doing that.

The public at large aren't following it, because, you see, I talk about the government's greedy position of taxing more, the opposition's position of criticizing the government for taxing, but we forget about the person who pays the taxes. You know, we've been saying so often within our caucuses that there is only one taxpayer, and that taxpayer is already feeding the frenzy of the federal government, regional government, municipal government and provincial government. We've got four different levels of government, all of them out there looking for more and more money, and the single, lone, little taxpayer, the middle-income earner, for the large part, is being forced constantly to reduce the amount of money that they live on themselves to feed this horrible appetite of government for more and more money.

1650

**Mrs Marland:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I think more than 13 members might wish to be present to hear the comments from the member for Markham. I don't see a quorum in the House.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. Would the clerk determine if a quorum is present.

**Mr Sorbara:** I think it's entirely inappropriate to interrupt your own member on a quorum call.

**Mrs Marland:** I think he's entitled to have the members here.

**Acting Clerk Assistant (Mr Franco Carrozza):** Speaker, a quorum is not present.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Acting Clerk Assistant:** A quorum is present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Markham may resume.

**Mr Cousens:** I respect the fact that the member for Mississauga South is so correct: The government has a responsibility to maintain a quorum and this is where they should be. In spite of the fact that it may be very painful to have to listen to me, I look forward to the chance.

The government has an attitude about taxation and the opposition has an attitude, but we forget often about the lonely individual who is really carrying the can for the people of Canada and Ontario. The taxpayers themselves have reached the point where they've just decided, "Well, if you can't fight 'em"—certainly you can't fight the government on taxation when they find out what you have, because this bill, Bill 138, makes it all the more punitive. The damages to someone who doesn't pay their taxes or some of the tax bills that are herein are going to have much heavier penalties than ever before.

What we've seen build up now is the underground economy. If there's anything that people will do rather than pay those taxes and the heavy increases in taxes, then you've seen the growth in the underground economy, which is something I'll be touching upon in my presentation.

I guess the point really boils down to the fact that here in Ontario we are now one of the most heavily taxed jurisdictions in North America. We are losing, if we haven't already lost, a large part of our competitive advantage over and against other provinces or northern states of the US, and we continue to add to the burden of the taxpayer. What we're talking about today is largely an increase in taxes which will affect the ongoing economy of the province.

I just have to say that we have never seen a hike the like of which was introduced to this House last year when Mr Laughren brought in his 1993 budget. What we're dealing with today in Bill 138 are further enactments that will put into law things that have already been announced in the 1993 budget and which the government is just now getting around to implementing.

When you start looking at the economic year of the province of Ontario, it's just full of lowlights. The

government, in its budget in 1993, levied the largest single amount of taxes in the history of the province of Ontario at one time. The government levied massive, record-breaking taxes: \$2 billion in new or increased taxes. At the same time, this government took pride in being able to hold the budget deficit to \$10 billion.

We all know that when the budget comes down two or three or four weeks from now that this government has not been able to keep the deficit to a \$10-billion number; it will even exceed that. In fact, if you looked at the way the books were put together last year, it was obvious that the number for the deficit was going to exceed \$10 billion.

What you're therefore seeing is that the total debt of the province of Ontario has gone up so that the total debt as of now, at the end of 1992-93, was \$70 billion. By the end of this next year, it'll be \$80 billion. The cost of paying the servicing on that debt is becoming even larger than some of the costs of running many of the ministries of the province of Ontario.

We've seen three downgrades in the credit rating of the province in the last three years, and we're facing the possibility of another downgrade in our credit rating. Certainly, in my question to the Minister of Finance today, in which I was dealing with the whole problem of his trying to take money from pensions for OPSEU and move it out of the budget for the year, it's just one way of moving money from the cost of running government today to some future government's responsibility. What he's really saying here is that he's giving further reason for the auditor not to look at the books of the province of Ontario and give them the check that they should.

Certainly, in fact, the Provincial Auditor last year refused to endorse the provincial books. Isn't that a statement? We have a Provincial Auditor who's saying the books are so cooked he's not in a position to even endorse them.

We're seeing a tax revolt within our province that has just taken on unbelievable proportions and has resulted in major reductions in the provincial revenues, due to the underground economy. I've been sitting with the finance and economic affairs committee on the underground economy, and when we started out, we said, "Well, the size of the underground economy, if we were to believe the Minister of Finance in response to a question I asked him—I asked him, "How much do you think the underground economy amounts to in the province?" He said, "Approximately 7% of the GDP." That's interesting. Then we went along and through our presentations we heard from the C.D. Howe Institute which said, "Well, it's in the order of maybe about 22%." Then when you start talking to other people, it could be as high as 30%.

The total amount of underground activity: It's not just tobacco or booze or drugs, but it's also in the construction industry and it's also now in jewellery, and you're also seeing it now in the illegal importation of food products across the border. For one thing, around Cornwall, chickens are coming across. There's an underground economy, believe it or not, in poultry.

What you're seeing then are people trying to escape the high taxation levels, and in fact people now have a



greater sense that the underground economy is more respectable to work within and around and through rather than trying to give the money to the government which just squanders the money.

I think there's no doubt that the underground economy is often regarded now as okay by most people. They don't see anything immoral or wrong in dealing with the underground economy. They feel that the money is better to be saved rather than to pay it into the coffers of this government. So the tax revolt continues, and what you're seeing today in bringing in Bill 138 and more taxes is more excuses for people to find another way of doing business outside of the normal government channels.

I think that when you look at the government's last year in review, you'll see an estimated \$1.6 billion in lost revenue, and this is another revenue shortfall, so the government has again failed to forecast accurately. Now, the recession's been tough. It's almost been a depression, but it's been impossible then for this government to really find ways of working within tougher times. You don't spend your way out of a recession, yet they've continued to try to do that.

The implementation of the social contract is really in many respects only a deferral of government costs. I'm very concerned about it producing long-term savings and dealing with some of the fundamental issues where we can reduce the size of government, reduce the cost of government so government can become more efficient.

During the last several years during this recession, business has reconfigured itself. It got a whole fresh approach to try to respond to changing times. They're using computers and people in innovative ways. They're going back into the marketplace skinnier and more in control of things and every level of management is involved in some way.

1700

Have we seen a similar type of renewal and change within the Ontario government structure during the last few years? I have to say that's not evident. The bureaucracy continues to be large and continues to be costly and government itself continues to be out of control.

One of the examples—it's a lowlight, I think, for the NDP in the last few years—is the Fair Tax Commission. After spending three years and \$8.2 million studying what was to be the Fair Tax Commission report, they found that the only way to make taxation fair was to make the middle-class family pay more tax.

When you see what the government of Ontario does through the Fair Tax Commission, it spent that kind of money over three years. In Alberta, and I don't necessarily agree with the result, they spent three months and \$200,000 to come out with a report that gave them some guidance.

I'm concerned with the government. If you think of one of the lowlights of this government, it has to have been and continues to be the Workers' Compensation Board. How in the Sam Hill could this board go ahead and build a \$180-million structure in downtown Toronto when already there is adequate space available within the greater Toronto area? How can they begin to justify that

cost? How can they come out with that number of \$180 million and then forget about the \$20 million or \$30 million for furnishings that are also going to be going into the WCB? How can the Workers' Compensation Board also come out with such huge assessment increases to business people as it has? Why is it that the Workers' Compensation Board is so out of control? It's filled with political appointments by the government.

If you look at the total debt of the province, you're seeing a deficit that's over \$11 billion, and this kind of cost is again further evidence of the government continuing to spend and spend and spend.

**Mr Sorbara:** Can I heckle from over here or not?

**Mr Cousens:** No. In fact, I'd appreciate it if all my colleagues would just pay attention the way the Dippers are. It's just amazing.

What we're seeing then is a total statement by this government. As it has continued to run the government, as it has continued to do what it wants to do, it has not been to bring control of government spending. They have not brought control through the administration of government. They have continued to allow it to build so that the people of Ontario are saying, "What do we do?"

When I begin my remarks today, I said: "Taxation. How does a constituent in the riding of Markham feel about another tax?" Speaking on their behalf, I have to say not happy. They weren't happy a few years ago when the government brought in, in 1989, the tire tax. That was a tax that had all the makings of doing something but didn't begin to touch on the nature of the problem.

My friend the member for Mississauga South has been Environment critic, and I was for a long period of time. We saw problems growing and developing in the province with the whole issue of tires.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Cousens:** I find it really upsetting when you're talking behind me.

We've had an increasing number of tires that are disposed of in different ways. You end up retreading them, you end up stockpiling them, we put them into landfills, and we've never really found a solution to tires. Thousands and thousands of tires have been stuck into Britannia and Keele Valley and other sites. They're taking up all kinds of premium space.

What we're really looking for is some way in which we could, in this society, find a solution to tires. We're looking for some initiative on how we, as a government and as a population, can find a way of getting rid of the tires. What we were looking for, through this tire tax the government was levying, was to find some incentive to recycle tires, to do something with them.

This government was in a position, in collecting this tax—\$130 million was collected through the tire tax, and what happened with it? What percentage of that tax was invested back into recycling? There is a host of things that could have been done with it. There are tire recycling companies that were looking for chips, yet they were importing them from the States. They were looking for ways of finding new applications for used tires. Yet what happened with the tire tax?

We ended up having a tax come in—\$130 million raised, \$5 per tire—and then how much did this government spend on it? I asked the parliamentary assistant how many dollars were spent of the \$130 million that was collected. He didn't have the exact number, but it's probably in the order of maybe \$40 million, plus or minus. So they collected \$130 million, and \$90 million of that is unaccounted for.

That really begins to make you ask, "Well, when the Liberals brought in this tax, what were they bringing it in for?" Our friend Mr Nixon said, "The tire tax will help fund efforts to support recycling and environmentally sound disposal." That was the purpose of the tire tax. How come some \$90 million of it never reached the recycling efforts? One of the points that has been raised by many of us is that if this money had been set aside and put into a special fund, there'd be something it would be possible to do with the used tires—but not so.

I look at why it was there. I wanted to point in particular to the remarks made by the honourable minister when he brought in this tire tax. The minister happened to be none other than Mr Grandmaître, who is the Liberal member from the Vanier area. He said: "Effective June 1 this year, a tax of \$5 will be charged on the purchase of each new pneumatic tire consumed or used in Ontario. New tires acquired with the purchase of a vehicle, including spare tires, will be subject to the \$5 tax." Isn't that something? Take that line along with the statement made by our friend Mr Nixon that it would be used to help the recycling efforts, and it begins to make you wonder just what was going to happen with this new tax.

I was interested, when I started following this, to read some of the Hansards of the day. Our friend Ms Bryden was the critic speaking on behalf of the people of Beaches-Woodbine in the New Democratic Party. She described what her agenda was going to be. She was calling for a minimum corporate tax—well, she's got that now—and then she said we shouldn't be taxing the middle- and low-income earners, and then she said we shouldn't be hurting the people in the greater Toronto area. Well, what happens with any tax is that everybody is hurt. The people in the Toronto area had their commercial concentration tax, which is a Metro tax, but the tire tax actually hit everybody in the province.

I'm amazed when I start to think of the damage done by that. I look at some of the points we tried to make to the Liberals when they were in power. Our friend Mr Grandmaître, in response to some questions by Mr Alan Pope—Mr Pope was saying: "What are you going to do with the extra money? What's going to happen with it?" Mr Grandmaître said: "What we will do with the extra \$5 is provide my friend the Minister of the Environment with more adequate funding for environmental programs. That is the intention of this extra tax. I'm sure that the Minister of the Environment will gladly accept this extra \$5 and provide us with better programs."

When you see that they collected as much money as they did and that only \$35 million or \$40 million of that went into recycling programs and some \$90 million went into the general revenue fund of the province, it makes you wonder what he said and what he meant, and what

he did and what he wanted to do.

The answer that was given to our friend Mr Pope at the time by the Minister of Revenue was, "The money will help recycling programs." During question period you get the question asked and the minister says: "Don't worry. We're going to look after it."

Three or four years later, I'm telling you right now, the Liberals did not do what they said they would do with that money. That money was not spent on recycling. That money was not invested into the environment. That money was put into the general revenue fund and did not go where they said it was going to go. If you think I'm happy about it, I'm not. What we ended up doing in the province of Ontario is importing sliced-up tires: Atlas tire in Toronto ended up having to buy shredded tires to do their work instead of being able to buy tires here in the province.

1710

The inconsistency of it all grates me and it grates every taxpayer. If they're told by a minister that the money is going to be used in one way and then it's not, what comeback do you have? Mr Grandmaître is an honourable man and a good person, but I have to say that at the time he was minister, he said this money would go to the Ministry of the Environment, and it did not. It did go to the Ministry of the Environment.

When you're dealing with a tax and wondering "Where is it going to go?" some people paying the tire tax probably thought, "Maybe I am doing something worthwhile with this \$5 tax." Some people might want to believe there's something positive coming out of their taxes, unless they're caught up in the underground economy, and then they can go and buy across the border and drive back with new tires on their car, which happens more often than not.

We have to touch upon the integrity of government. When a person is asked a question in this House by a member of the opposition, we want an answer that's honest and straight and true, not like the answer that I got from Mr Grandmaître, the Liberal Minister of Revenue, the one here in Hansard where he said it was going to be used for proper things.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I don't believe there's a quorum present.

**The Acting Speaker:** Could the clerk please determine whether a quorum is present.

**Acting Clerk Assistant:** Speaker, a quorum is not present.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Acting Clerk Assistant:** Speaker, a quorum is now present.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Markham may resume.

**Mr Cousens:** I thank the honourable member. The government has a responsibility to maintain quorum, and I really appreciate that. The New Democrats probably don't mind what I have to say, but the Liberals probably will. The former Minister of the Environment is here, for



one, who has a memory of how the money was not spent from the tire tax. It has to be one of the issues that the Minister of the Environment then, the Honourable James Bradley, as he was known so affectionately by those who knew him in the Ministry of the Environment—he didn't spend the money that was collected on the tire taxes.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** It's the Treasurer's fault. I didn't get it.

**Mr Cousens:** It's the Treasurer's fault that he didn't get it. But it's government policy. The government starts off with creating an impression that it's going to use the money collected through that tax in a specific way, and then when it isn't, what comeback do you have?

Well, today is a rare day. I have the chance here in the Legislature now on this day, April 11, to come back and remind the Liberals of their tax they brought in in 1989. That tax that they brought in was a failure. Today it is being revoked in Bill 138 and today we're seeing the end of it, and I say, "Good." Bill 138 means the end of the tire tax formally and officially. It's an example of stupid taxation.

I say that because a few moments ago we heard from the former Minister of Health, the member for Oriole, who was talking with great pleasure about the tire tax. I had no pleasure at the time. I spoke against it at the time, and today, to see the New Democrats come back and fulfil the member for Beaches-Woodbine and other members of the New Democratic caucus who at that time opposed the tire tax—today, to repeal it, I say thank you. I think it's an example where at last we've done something—I wish that in fact the money that had been invested in all the tires that were taxed could have assisted in the disposal of tires. It could have done something to enforce people who are dumping tires illegally, it could have done something to assist this government in developing more recycling programs to make better use of those tires.

So Bill 138 has another aspect to it that touches on the Liberals and their regime: the commercial concentration tax. The commercial concentration tax was the tax that they had—in fact, that's a fact. Just to go back to the tires, the member for Mississauga South at the time was our Environment critic. What we were really saying, and it was one of the earlier points that I brought up, I would have been happier if my fishing licence had gone into building replenishment stocks for fish. So sometimes you could have a designated tax for specific purposes.

Back a few years ago the member for Mississauga South, as Environment critic for the Ontario PC caucus, brought in a bill that would have designated the tire tax funds to do the things that the government was saying it was going to do, and the Liberals defeated that bill. All Mrs Marland was hoping for was, "Okay, you're going to collect this money," and she was careful enough to say, "I don't like a tax but I'm prepared to support some purpose for it if it has an environmental purpose." The government revoked that. They did not support it and took the chance to defeat it.

What has now happened is that the government has, as well, the commercial concentration tax. In 1989, the then Liberal government under David Peterson brought in the

commercial concentration tax. This was a tax on property in and around the greater Toronto area, one of those taxes that, if you really started to look at it, would have raised \$113 million during its current fiscal year. It really meant that Toronto became less competitive to the tourist industry as anything. Anyone who was putting their car in a parking lot immediately saw an increase in the cost of parking. It created pandemonium when it came in. As with all taxes, people get used to it after a while and after a while people forget about it.

The problem we had, the Liberals brought in the commercial concentration tax. It was a tax specifically directed to the people in the greater Toronto area. I have plenty of data on it, but the point is that it was \$1 per square foot and it just added up to a gross increase in parking costs, and when you have a city that's already had little money spent on infrastructure, a city that's facing gridlock often enough with the traffic just coming to a full stop, a city that has not had the development during that period of the 1980s in building the subway systems and the infrastructure more and more, what you were doing was taxing the existing infrastructure even further to make this place less and less competitive. So today we see as well the removal of the commercial concentration tax.

But the NDP are a little more subtle. Instead of coming along and just removing the commercial concentration tax, what they've done now is levy a tax of 8% on all parkers. Those who have a monthly contract are exempted, but what they've now said is that we will tax you if you're going to park your car anywhere, so that there's an 8% provincial sales tax on parking cars.

So on the one hand, they remove the tax by the Liberals, but on the other, which was a Metro, greater-Toronto-area-wide tax, the New Democrats here in Ontario are saying everybody who pays a parking fee will have an 8% provincial sales tax levied upon them.

**Mr Hope:** There are exemptions.

**Mr Cousens:** With a few little exemptions, but if you generated \$100 million from the other tax in the greater Toronto area, they'll probably generate \$150 million from this new tax. There's no loser when it comes to a government levying a tax; the government's always going to be the winner and the taxpayer's going to be the loser. You keep on saying again and again, "They've done it one more time."

1720

What I'd like to talk about is the bill itself. What we have are a number of ingredients in Bill 138 and they're very, very significant when it comes to the way in which it touches everybody in the province of Ontario. It pushes us just that much closer to the wall and makes Ontario that much less competitive with other jurisdictions.

The Retail Sales Tax Act: First of all, we'll touch upon insurance premiums. The 8% retail sales tax will apply to insurance premiums. When you start thinking of insurance, is that a luxury? I don't think so. Insurance for your car, it's only going to be 5% that they're going to charge on car insurance, but when you say "only," that's just when you say it quickly. A tax is a tax is a tax, and if

it's 5% on already very high premiums, when you know that people are paying a minimum of \$1,000 on average—it's closer to \$1,500 now. I receive letters regularly from people whose automobile taxes are now up in the \$3,000 range after they've had a couple of incidents. Whether those incidents are accidents caused by their own fault doesn't really matter; 5% of \$3,000 is no small potatoes.

The government came along, and by having all the extra taxes on insurance we're seeing an increase in premiums. I'm not exactly sure how many millions of dollars this is generating for the province of Ontario. We'll find out in this year's budget, because it's hard to find out other than that. What happens now is that the person who has to pay more tax on their car insurance may well reduce the amount of protection they should have had, and then they become vulnerable to an incident or an accident or whatever is going to happen with them. That is not where we should be when it comes to insurance.

People should have insurance for all the right reasons, and that is to protect them and to protect society in case something should happen that they themselves by themselves wouldn't otherwise be able to afford. So the group helps each other. Well, the person who helped themselves on this deal happens to be the province of Ontario, in coming out once more with the insurance tax.

What a badly introduced tax too. Wasn't it something? Last year when it was announced it was pandemonium for the insurance companies and for the people who had their insurance programs. The government hadn't even consulted with the insurance industry to find out how best to implement the tax. It was as if a few people at Queen's Park sat down and said, "Here's a good way for you to raise some money, Mr Minister of Finance, and it's going to be on insurance premiums," and they concocted some numbers, came up with a program, and not until after it was introduced and announced in the House did they begin to carry out the discussions with the insurance industry. In the meantime, insurance agents across the province of Ontario were trying to deal with the questions and answers on when the new tax became effective and how much and when. All the computer programs had to be changed with little or no notice.

What you're starting to deal with is a government that acts without giving advance notice. It deals with things just ad hoc. It doesn't have a process so that it can deal and work with people.

So the insurance increase, number one, was wrong, but it was wrong the way it was introduced. It was terrible the way it was introduced, because there wasn't an insurance broker across the province of Ontario who didn't have heartache at how to handle it. There were some companies that had a terribly tough time just getting their computer programs changed in time to get it ready. So the cost of changing it within the insurance industry itself was an added cost. The whole system started to change.

It also affected company benefits, because companies that were providing benefits for employees suddenly had a new cost on top of the existing benefit structure they

provided: the additional tax, just another little layer, another way of siphoning off the money of those companies.

I don't find this amusing at all. In fact, I find it all part of this gradual process of the government intruding further and further into every area of society, cutting into it, taking whatever it can, and in this instance without considering the whole impact: the whole impact on the industry itself, on the people with marginal incomes who have a car, who want to get protection, who have certain benefits and want to have them and now they're being cut back.

They're being cut back, because what's happened now is that companies can no longer pay; individuals can no longer pay. The government always get its money. When it levies a tax, it always gets its money. But the people who are out there trying to earn an income, trying to make a living, trying to make ends meet, are the ones who are the loser.

When you start looking at the tax on insurance for the province of Ontario, it's one of the worst introduced and one of the worst taxes you could have had, because it didn't miss anyone.

I will just comment briefly on the commercial concentration tax. I touched on it earlier. The Liberals in 1989 thought, "Isn't this a nice way of raising some money, to tax parking lots in and around the greater Toronto area?"

Probably the one thing it hurt most of all was the tourist industry. You have Toronto, which should and must and will continue to be a wonderful attraction for people to come to for different kinds of exhibitions and shows. We want people to come here, as part of the different programs that companies will have, and spend their money and enjoy our city and enjoy Ontario.

What happened when we had the high tax, the commercial concentration tax within the greater Toronto area, was that it hit hotels especially hard. It meant that some of the conferences and conventions that would have been coming to Toronto started to look twice, because Ontario, though it has a great climate, good people and many other good things, was becoming and continues to be a very expensive place for people to spend their holidays.

Some of the other measures that are included in Bill 138, effective May 20, 1993: Warranty, parts and labour will be subject to the 8% retail sales tax. It's the kind of thing where if there's any kind of loophole or door out there where someone hasn't been touched by the tax man in Ontario, then you're going to find a government that'll find an additional measure to go out and make some money.

That's exactly what happened here: warranty, parts and labour. You buy your new car, your anything, your new washing machine, your new whatever, and the warranty and parts are now going to be taxed. That's one of the things where you have a certain sense that, hey, the warranty is something that's going to be free after you've made your purchase, but not so with Mr Rae's government. As to anyone who can afford to buy anything that's new and has a warranty, they're going to tax the labour and the other parts of those services that go into it.



Very often you'll find that the company providing the service will do it gratis, but the fact is that they're having to absorb that cost. It just increases the cost of doing business and it makes it all the less attractive for them to want to be here in Ontario.

Sure, you raise some money on it. Is it worth it? The answer's no. Does it take away something of the difference between Ontario and other provinces? I haven't done enough research to know whether other provinces have this particular tax, but let's say that if we didn't have it, it would be just one of those other good reasons to be here in Ontario.

"The retail sales tax exemption"—it's funny how it reads in their writings—"for sand, clay, soil and gravel and unfinished stone will be eliminated effective July 1, 1993." It's as if it's an exemption. You never had to pay tax, for as long as I've known, and maybe some of the people who have been around here a lot longer know better, but the fact is you weren't paying a tax on sand, clay, soil and gravel and unfinished stone.

Do you know who that affects? First of all, it's going to affect every municipality, because there isn't a road that isn't built that doesn't require those ingredients, and every municipality means it's going to be the ratepayers, the taxpayers in Mississauga and Markham and every other community in the province of Ontario who are going to be paying that tax that's now collected by the province for sand and gravel, because that's where most of the sand and gravel goes; it goes into our roads. It's just another way of taxing your local municipalities. It's going to net the province another \$200 million or something. What you're doing at the same time is taxing, passing down to the local ratepayers this cost in overhead.

1730

I just wish this government wouldn't do it, because already at the local level the communities are paying so much in taxes. Those taxes are some of the best dollars invested by any government at any level, because at that time they're trying to serve their own local community. But they're the hard-earned tax dollars of the property owners, who are now going to have to pay this tax on sand, clay, soil and gravel.

The other place that's going to be paying most is the whole construction industry, and if there's any industry in Ontario that really has to get rolling again, it has to be the construction industry. We're seeing the automotive industry showing signs of recovery, but when you have an additional tax, it's an additional cost. It's an additional 8% that goes on the cost of doing business as far as the province of Ontario is concerned.

I don't like it. It's just another way of adding to the provincial coffers and making Ontario uncompetitive. Unless you're the Workers' Compensation Board, where money doesn't matter—and it can spend \$180 million without even considering where it's going to come from because the taxpayers will pay for it—but if you're an industry or a company, then you say, "How much is it going to cost to build this structure in Ontario versus Quebec or south of the border or in another jurisdiction?" Will you think twice about it? Is it part of the cost of

doing business? It is, and it's just the kind of disincentive that makes companies think twice about locating in the province of Ontario.

I suppose when you start looking at it, if you want to even buy sand for your child's sandbox outside and you buy it at one of the nurseries, you're going to have to pay for that as well. How shocking. Aren't there some things in life that should be free, the air we breathe, the water we drink? I see we're going to have a tax on that one soon too. We going to soon start paying for that. I'm somewhat sympathetic to it because there's a point at which we will run out of clean water if we don't start preserving it, but there's a sense in which we've got to teach people to be responsible for what they've got.

We happen to have in Ontario some of the greatest natural resources any jurisdiction could hope for, and we're losing the competitive edge by taxing them all. Our hydro is no longer a big saving over other jurisdictions. When companies would settle in Ontario to do their business, there was an advantage because power was cheaper in Ontario. It's no longer cheaper than any other jurisdiction.

**Mr Mills:** What about Darlington? Tell me about that.

**Mr Cousens:** You'll have a chance, Gordon. You'll have a chance to comment. Nuclear as well: I think nuclear power happens to be very clean and very efficient, and I have some concerns about your position in not supporting nuclear energy, especially closing down Darlington and all those places. I think your government is systematically trying to move Ontario into brownouts and we're going to see a whole new level of lack of service.

Anyway, taxing sand and gravel is one of the ingredients of Bill 138.

I'm concerned as well that on July 1, 1993, this bill makes it law that the Ontario—Incredible! rebate program will be eliminated. Taxes paid on goods and accommodation by visitors to Ontario prior to July 1 are still eligible for a rebate, as long as claims are made within a year of the transaction date.

They used to call it the VAT tax. If you were in the UK or in other countries and you bought goods in another country and you were going out of the country, you'd collect all your bills and receipts, and when you got to the airport, you'd submit them. If it was enough, it was worthwhile sending in and getting your rebate on your expenditures.

Don't we want people from outside Ontario who come here, either as tourists or convention visitors or others, to spend their money? There's an advantage now with the Canadian dollar going so low that Americans are coming over and are starting to spend money in Canada. But this is just another way, when they're here, that you show a sense of hospitality and that you're really glad to have them. As these taxes are going to be used for people in Ontario and not yourself, because if you're going back to New York or Ohio or Manitoba or Quebec, you're being forgiven the cost of Ontario provincial sales tax, doesn't that give a good message to them?

"Spend your money, keep track of the provincial sales

tax, and when you go, add it up, show the receipts and we'll give you a rebate." That gives them a message that we're glad they were here and glad they were investing in Ontario merchandise and goods and services. When they go back home, they're going to get something back for it, and when they get that cheque, that's something they'll be glad to have. This bill removes that rebate. That rebate was another one of those little incentives for people to spend money on Ontario merchandise here in Ontario when they were visiting.

**Mr Mills:** They give it back in the States too, when we leave.

**Mr Cousens:** I want to have every advantage for people to come to Ontario. We had it, and the New Democrats, the member for Durham East is proud of the fact that he's making Ontario a place people won't want to come to. That's fine. That's the New Democrats' logic. That it escaped the Liberals' taxation policy and that it's something that's been in place for a period of time shows you there was benefit to it.

I like to see the small entrepreneur start up, have a business and make a go of it. That's the strength of our country, when you have small people who have their own money and start off and they put that money into a new product or a new company and hire a few employees and build it into something. One of the examples of a very successful operation was the little home-brew enterprises that started up across Ontario over the last several years. They just came up overnight.

I have one acquaintance I would meet over the summer. He started up one of these little brew-your-own-beer enterprises. He quit his job, put all his money into it and began to make a very fine drink, ale and beer, homemade. People would go in and would buy their bottles and would do what they were doing. What this government has done is, "Effective August 1, 1993, a tax of 26 cents will apply to each litre of beer or wine made at a produce-your-own beer and wine establishment." What that has done to these small entrepreneurs—and none of them were big people; they were mostly people who had a dream and a hope of running their own business. The bank was mostly—

**Mr Mills:** They turned back to the real beer. They get fed up with it. Don't blame—

**Mr Cousens:** Gordon, what's the matter with you today?

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Durham East, come to order.

**Mr Cousens:** He's really out of control today. Maybe he hasn't had a beer for a while and maybe he should go and try one. Maybe right now he could toddle off.

I'm suggesting that those small entrepreneurs had established their wine-making and beer-making businesses and very good-quality products were coming out, and they're increasingly popular, probably competition to the large manufacturers of beer. But what's happened? This tax brought in by the New Democrats of 26 cents on each litre of beer is just the kind of thing that started to change their business. The tax brought in in Bill 138 meant there was a tax increase of 26 cents on August 1 last year, and

then 31 cents on June 15, 1994, and then it increases to 38 cents on June 15, 1995. Talk about a government that's hungry for money. They're saying here to the small business person and the small entrepreneur: "Here we are. We're going to take everything we can from you."

I'm not happy with Bill 138. There are elements of the bill I'm happy with. The fact that the government has repealed the tire tax is good, but when I look at the effect on insurance and the effect on the small business people, when I see the total income the government's taking out of this economy of over \$2 billion, it really is not what Ontario needs as a good dose of medicine.

What Ontario needs is a government that's going to move to bring its spending in order, to get control of where it really should be. This is a government that should look at the unemployment situation, that for every \$40,000 raised in taxes it means the end of one job. This is a government that should start very seriously, instead of just having more taxes and more tax coming in on every project and program that people can have, start to do something about—there were 144,000 fewer people who were employed in 1993 than in 1990. In 1993 there were, on average, 569,000 Ontarians on the unemployment rolls every month, an increase of 238,000 relative to 1990 levels, almost 250,000 more people on the unemployment rolls. There were 129,000 fewer people employed in the manufacturing sector in 1993 than in 1990, and 73,000 fewer in the construction industry than there were in 1990.

1740

Despite past and planned government spending, the unemployment rate in Ontario continues to remain above 9%, and it's projected to stay above 9% through to 1997.

The government has spent \$12 billion over the past three years to create or sustain 300,000 jobs. At best, this expenditure of \$40,000 per job has provided only very expensive, short-term, symptomatic relief.

What are the people saying? The people I respect, the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, are saying of Bob Rae's government:

"Revenue is not the problem. Expenditure is the problem. There is no more room to move on taxes. Every new tax is a blow against the fragile economic recovery under way."

That's what the Ontario Chamber of Commerce has to say about more taxes.

The Ontario Home Builders' Association said:

"A modest recovery in the housing market is expected in 1994. Housing starts should total 50,000, and this includes 28,000 single detached houses. The recovery will be very fragile and could easily be derailed by government decisions."

The Retail Council of Canada says:

"In last year's submission, we reflected on the dangers of continuing high deficits. We are extremely disappointed that the Ontario government still will not take meaningful steps to change the situation."

We're talking about a government that is tax-hungry. They won't back off. Since 1985, the Liberals and the



NDP have levied 65 new or increased taxes. Ontarians have absorbed \$7.6 billion in new or increased taxes since 1985. From 1985 to 1993, personal income per capita in Ontario increased by 53.5%—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Cousens:** I'll repeat that because of the interruption. From 1985 to 1993, personal income per capita in Ontario increased by 53.5%, but the per capita provincial tax burden increased by 73.3%.

In 1985, provincial tax revenues equalled 8.8% of the Ontario gross domestic product but will account for 11.2% of our gross domestic product this year. From 8.8% in 1985, we're now spending 11.2% of our gross domestic product on taxes this year.

The average Ontario family paid \$663 more in taxes in 1993 than when the NDP took office. The average Ontario taxpayer paid \$663 more in taxes in 1993 than just three and half years ago.

During the NDP government's term in office, 3.4 million Ontario families have seen their provincial taxes increased, while only approximately 440,000 families have benefited from tax reductions. So 3.4 million people have seen tax increases and some 440,000 families have benefited from tax deductions.

It's just this kind of government that has led to trouble in people getting back on their feet, trouble in getting the economy going. We have to be honest with ourselves: We can't blame the NDP totally for the rotten economy. A lot of it started from Mr Peterson's government before them. But this government hasn't had the sense to change the policies. What we're seeing now is just a continuation of overtaxation, a government that's overhungry, a government that continues to be fed by taxpayers' dollars, and the taxpayers increasingly feeling violated that their money is not being well spent.

The future: What is it? I have to say, Bill 138 is before this House. It's almost a fait accompli. The government has not yet ever backed off in bringing forward a new tax. Backbenchers, when they're presented with that, it becomes such an important thing, they end up—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Interjections are out of order.

**Mr Cousens:** Madam Speaker, I don't know what's the matter with Mr Mills today, but he'll have a chance to speak. I'll certainly give him an opportunity. He's such a good person at times, but today he's just—

**Mrs Marland:** Gord, wait for your two minutes. You'll get it.

**Mr Mills:** I get very aggravated.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** We noticed. Take a Valium.

**Mr Cousens:** I'm not going to suggest that the member should take any kind of medicine at all, because maybe that's the problem already; I don't know.

I just feel that we have a problem with taxation. I started off by saying that governments have a propensity to raise taxes, and that has been the case with every government that's been around, but the Liberals and the NDP have had a greater propensity to do that than any

previous government. This last budget of a \$2-billion tax increase that touches on insurance, on brew-your-own-beer, on parking lots and on income tax: At just about every level you're talking about a government that has really lost its sense of priorities.

In my earlier readings of Marion Bryden, the member for Beaches-Woodbine, when she was challenging the government to pull back on its tire tax when David Peterson was Premier and Bob Nixon was Treasurer at the time and Mr Grandmaitre was the Minister of Revenue, here was the sense in which you saw the good socialist philosophy of Ms Bryden coming in. She wasn't talking about the kind of onerous, heavy, ongoing taxes that are now coming out of the Bob Rae government. The people of Ontario have been increasingly disappointed that these taxes continue to mount and they continue to come upon us. This Bill 138 makes it impossible for anyone to try to escape those taxes unless they move to the underground economy.

It's a government that is greedy beyond belief. I wish the government would get its financial house in order. Stop spending so much. Bring things under control. Stop seeing the need to raise more in taxes. Try to get money back in the economy so that, first of all, the investors who have some money will invest in Ontario and outsiders will come in and say, "Ontario's a good place to work." But when they see these high taxes we have already, it takes away the incentive for them to come and settle and establish their businesses in Ontario.

We don't have that much longer to wait. What happens is that the government has a term of office. We could have an election this fall. I'm inclined to believe that the government will go right through to next spring some time. The government has to call an election.

Here's the way it works. July 30 was the day the writ was dropped by David Peterson; July 30, 1990, when David Peterson felt that he was going to move to a rapid, quick victory. The way it works is that five years from that date is July 30, 1995, and an election has to be called within 55 days of that date. So September 23, 1995, is the last day that Mr Bob Rae and his group of elected people—

**Mr Hope:** November 23?

**Mr Cousens:** No, September 23. I hope I didn't say that, Randy. September 23 is the last possible day that the people of Ontario will have to tolerate an NDP government in the province of Ontario, unless at that time people come along and say: "We like the 32 tax increases they brought in. We like the way this government brought in the Interim Waste Authority and brought in three megadumps for Durham, York and Peel. We're really proud of the way this government has decided things for us. We think that they brought a new level of intelligence to government by having a huge megadump on the border between the cities of Vaughan and King and one over in Caledon and one over in Whitevale."

This is a government that really has a sense of the environment. This is a government that has done so much for police and law and order, and then coming along and having the kind of support that it has given to the police force.

This is a government that opposed standardized testing, but none the less comes along and starts talking about all kinds of things about education but doesn't begin to do the right things for education. This is a government that's cut back on universities and colleges and, at that point, this is a government that really knows how to get education going.

1750

This is a government that has trampled seniors in the way it brought in its Bill 110 as it affects seniors in seniors homes. This is a government that has passed on more and more expenses and costs to people at the lowest level. This is a government that has taxed and taxed and taxed, and here's a government that is going to have to face the electorate, because the electorate is not going to forget them.

The electorate didn't forget David Peterson and his people back in 1990. They said to them: "Look, we've had enough of David Peterson and his policy. We know what they brought to Ontario. They brought more taxation." It was at a time when Ontario was at its highest, and the Liberals went and squandered it. Now they will remember the NDP for what it has done and what it has not done during its four or five years of office. That's going to give people an opportunity, I hope, to look at someone else.

That person happens to be Mr Michael Harris, the leader of our party, the member for Nipissing. Mike Harris's policies, when it comes to taxation, are quite different from what you're talking about. First of all, he will support small business, and one of the key things that he wants to do is to help small business so that we understand how important and how integral to the future success of the province of Ontario small business really is.

The next thing is, he will come out with a tax freeze. Additional tax hikes do not create higher tax revenues. The rise in the underground economy shows the level of frustration that the taxpayer has. Higher taxes are counterproductive to economic recovery, and so he will not have new taxes. He will make that point, and he'll make it again and again and again.

He will reject any plan to increase payroll taxes and that seems to be one of the things that this government has done through Bill 138. It's a payroll tax when you start taxing people on their health benefits.

He will reform the Workers' Compensation Board, and there is something that needs to be done. There is no doubt that the Workers' Compensation Board is out of control. Why would this government prevent the opposition parties from at least looking at the expenditures of the new \$180-million building? We went to the public accounts committee and tried to have a committee struck that would look at the spending that went into the new structure for the workers' compensation, and the NDP majority blocked that. They blocked the opportunity for people to investigate and review what was happening there.

One thing we would do for sure is remove the corporate minimum tax. What a nuisance tax that is. It's

something again that was predictable. Certainly, the member for Beaches-Woodbine—it was talked about several years ago and there it is.

We would eliminate the \$50 corporate filing fee, and that again is just something that gets in the way of progress.

Repeal Bill 40: If there's anything that set Ontario back in the last several years, and in the future will continue to set us back, it's Bill 40. That is the whole labour legislation that gives rights to unions to expand and to grow, and certainly that's one way for the government to increase the size of its base.

But I'll tell you, Madam Speaker, it's one of those disincentives for business when they look at this government and say, "Hey, how labour-oriented is Ontario?" With Bill 40, the most advanced, the most unique, the one jurisdiction in the world that sets us apart from all others is Bill 40. It's one thing to be leaders, but it's one thing to be so far out that you're not in any position to maintain the balance that's so important, to keep that delicate balance between business, industry and government working together.

We need to develop a project that gets this government on a balanced budget. This is not going to happen. This government doesn't know how to balance its budget, and we have to move towards some way in which we can balance the budget.

There are many more points that I'd like to make on this, but I can say, in brief, that we're talking in an age where people are frustrated with taxation, and I think they're frustrated with politicians. They're sick and tired of us coming in here and just continuing to pick their pockets, take their money and then spend it on the wrong things.

There is no doubt that this government is spending the money incorrectly. They're continuing to spend on housing. They're continuing to waste money through an overly generous social assistance program. We're continuing to have over a million extra health cards in the province of Ontario than there are people. We're seeing issues abound.

Housing is an example where you're building more and more so-called affordable housing and yet where is the need? What is the need? Is this the way to do it? Are there other ways in which you could provide housing for people through subsidies rather than building new housing?

We have a spending problem in the province of Ontario. We're spending beyond our means. We have a taxation problem. We're taxing beyond the means for people to pay. We have a credibility problem because we've lost the trust of the people who elected us. They look to us and they say, regardless of who the government is, who do they trust any more? How do you distinguish someone who's going to do what is right and good and for the right reasons, for the benefit of all people?

How do we begin to find a government that's going to have the balance that governments should have? It doesn't take long for us to lose that lustre. It didn't take



long for this government to lose its lustre. What we're seeing here is the sense that by coming out with all these extra taxes, it again proves that governments just aren't there to be trusted. I have to say, can we trust any government to do it right?

I certainly believe that the kind of platform that is coming forward from my leader is one that I believe in. I believe there is a real hope out there that there'll be a government that comes to power that will begin to create jobs and create an environment for jobs, create a climate for business, so that when we look at Ontario, it's a place where people will want to settle, a place where people will want to be, a place where people know that there is something really working for them, that government is working with the people, for the people, by the people, that it's a government that is investing in a better future for all of us.

Bill 138 is not taking the province of Ontario in the correct direction. I have to believe that if the New Democrat members will take time, they will look at the effect of this bill and will vote against it. I will be voting against it and I sincerely hope, as we get ready for the new budget that will be announced in about four weeks' time, the Treasurer at that time will not bring in more increases in taxes. We've really got to start seeing a cutting back on taxes.

This bill did at least cut back on the tire tax. It could have gone further and cut back on others. What they maybe can do in the meantime is cut back on their spending, cut back on what they're doing and reduce the expectations of people so that government doesn't have to do it all. Maybe together we can make this the province we really want it to be. That's my dream; that is my hope.

*Applause.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions or comments? The member for Cochrane South.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** Thank you, Madam Speaker, I was actually getting—

**Mrs Marland:** I thought you might have applauded a little bit.

**Mr Bisson:** If only you knew.

**Interjection:** In either official language?

**Mr Bisson:** That was in either official language.

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** That's the third official language.

**Mr Bisson:** That was the third one.

I was listening with great interest to the comments of the member for Markham, and it was interesting to note his rhetoric in regard to some of the issues that he talks about. I would say that the member is probably one of the more eloquent members, as he would say, who knows how to play the game in regard to espousing on points and making them look a little bit different than they are.

I would like to see how the member would comment in regard to some of the comments he made around tax increases. He went on at great length to talk about how the Liberal administration and the New Democratic administration had done some 65 tax increases over a

period of some eight years. I remember quite vividly in this House on the governments that as a matter of fact the member opposite from me sat in regard to a number of tax increases. I can count a total of some 40 in one administration alone, I remember, in one of the last administrations the former member took part in. Is that maybe some creative thinking or is it maybe just a little bit of unfocused thinking on the part of the member?

When it comes to being able to direct criticism across the floor, I think one first of all has to look into one's own heart. I understand, quite frankly, as the member puts it, that we must play the game to a certain extent, and these debates are exactly about that, about being able to demonstrate one's ideological point of view or being able to demonstrate one's political savvy to a certain extent. I would be interested in knowing from the member opposite if he remembers the numerous tax increases on the part of the former Tory administration, under a number of premiers who I remember with a lot of fond interest. I would like to know if the member for Markham would like to comment on some of those hefty, hefty, I remember, increases in taxes over a period of I think it was 42 years.

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I'm delighted to stand here to congratulate the member for Markham on such an excellent presentation, not only with regard to this particular bill but with regard to the financial situation in the province of Ontario. The member for Markham has been following this very closely and for a number of years and I would hope that the government members would pay heed to his comments.

I was very interested that early on this afternoon—I would suggest that the members from the government would be interested in this—one of the first issues the member for Markham raised was the tire tax and the appropriateness of eliminating the tire tax. I would assume that the government members would be interested in that particular comment.

I know from my experience on the Metropolitan council that there was a great deal of concern with regard to that tax. It was implemented, of course, by the Liberals. Bob Nixon in his budget of 1989, I believe it was, brought in that tax and I believe about 15 other taxes in that particular year: the commercial concentration tax, the tire tax and a number of taxes.

As the member for Markham has pointed out, that particular tax was to be used for research and recycling, but the information we were getting at Metropolitan Toronto, because we had grave concerns about the waste management issue, was that while over \$100 million in revenues were being raised, very little of it, perhaps \$20 million or less, was actually being put into research to reduce the waste within the province of Ontario.

The member for Markham has pointed that out. He's pointed out many other aspects of the grave financial situation we have and I commend him for that.

**The Acting Speaker:** There will be time for further questions or comments when this debate resumes. It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 1:30.

The House adjourned at 1803.

**ERRATUM**

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Page</b> | <b>Column</b> | <b>Lines</b> | <b>Should read:</b>  |
|------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|--|
| 106        | 5303        | 1             | 32           | NEL and FEL, non-economic loss and future economic loss,   |
|            |             |               | 33           | and like that, that just didn't go far enough. As a matter |
|            |             |               | 34           | of fact, in a lot of cases it made matters worse.          |



# CONTENTS

Monday 11 April 1994

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>MEMBERS' STATEMENTS</b>                     |      |
| <b>French-language education</b>               |      |
| Mr Grandmaitre                                 | 5489 |
| <b>Georgina Leimonis</b>                       |      |
| Mr Harnick                                     | 5489 |
| <b>Oxford County Federation of Agriculture</b> |      |
| Mr Sutherland                                  | 5489 |
| <b>Food banks</b>                              |      |
| Mrs O'Neill                                    | 5489 |
| <b>Sexual abuse of children</b>                |      |
| Mr Turnbull                                    | 5490 |
| <b>Newspaper article</b>                       |      |
| Mr Mills                                       | 5490 |
| <b>Cancer treatment</b>                        |      |
| Mrs Sullivan                                   | 5490 |
| <b>Orillia Perch Festival</b>                  |      |
| Mr McLean                                      | 5490 |
| <b>Race relations in Kitchener-Waterloo</b>    |      |
| Mr Cooper                                      | 5491 |

|                              |            |
|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>ORAL QUESTIONS</b>        |            |
| <b>Fire safety</b>           |            |
| Mrs McLeod                   | 5491       |
| Ms Gigantes                  | 5491       |
| <b>Social assistance</b>     |            |
| Mrs McLeod                   | 5492       |
| Mr Silipo                    | 5492       |
| <b>Pension funds</b>         |            |
| Mr Cousins                   | 5493       |
| Mr Charlton                  | 5493       |
| <b>Head injury treatment</b> |            |
| Mr Jim Wilson                | 5494       |
| Mrs Grier                    | 5494, 5495 |
| Mr Jackson                   | 5494       |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Cancer treatment</b>                  |      |
| Mrs Sullivan                             | 5495 |
| Mrs Grier                                | 5495 |
| <b>Metropolitan Toronto police chief</b> |      |
| Mr Harnick                               | 5495 |
| Mr Christopherson                        | 5496 |
| <b>Government spending</b>               |      |
| Mr Charlton                              | 5496 |
| Mr Offer                                 | 5496 |
| <b>Police services</b>                   |      |
| Mr Murphy                                | 5496 |
| Mr Christopherson                        | 5497 |
| <b>Job security</b>                      |      |
| Mr McLean                                | 5497 |
| Ms Lankin                                | 5498 |
| <b>Forest management</b>                 |      |
| Mr Bisson                                | 5498 |
| Mr Hampton                               | 5498 |
| <b>Transportation for the disabled</b>   |      |
| Mr Curling                               | 5499 |
| Mr Pouliot                               | 5499 |
| <b>Land use planning</b>                 |      |
| Mr David Johnson                         | 5499 |
| Mr Philip                                | 5499 |

|                           |      |
|---------------------------|------|
| <b>MOTIONS</b>            |      |
| <b>Committee sittings</b> |      |
| Mr Charlton               | 5500 |
| Agreed to                 | 5500 |

|                        |      |
|------------------------|------|
| <b>PETITIONS</b>       |      |
| <b>Firearms safety</b> |      |
| Mr Eddy                | 5500 |
| Mr Tilson              | 5500 |
| Mr Miclash             | 5501 |
| Mrs Witmer             | 5501 |

|                               |      |
|-------------------------------|------|
| <b>Land-lease communities</b> |      |
| Mrs Mathysen                  | 5500 |
| Mr Mills                      | 5501 |
| <b>Education financing</b>    |      |
| Ms Poole                      | 5500 |
| <b>Video games</b>            |      |
| Mrs Witmer                    | 5501 |
| <b>Lap dancing</b>            |      |
| Mr Sutherland                 | 5501 |
| <b>Highway safety</b>         |      |
| Mr Conway                     | 5502 |
| <b>Retail sales tax</b>       |      |
| Mr Hansen                     | 5502 |
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>     |      |
| Mr Hayes                      | 5502 |
| <b>Health care</b>            |      |
| Mrs Caplan                    | 5502 |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>SECOND READINGS</b>   |            |
| <b>Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and French-language School Boards Statute Law Amendment Act, 1994, Bill 143, Mr Philip</b> | 5502       |
| Agreed to  | 5503       |
| <b>Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 138, Mr Laughren</b>   |            |
| Mr Sutherland  | 5503, 5512 |
| Mr Cousins   | 5504, 5513 |
| Mrs Caplan   | 5504, 5513 |
| Mrs Marland  | 5509, 5512 |
| Mr Arnott  | 5512       |
| Mr Mills   | 5513       |
| Mr David Johnson   | 5524       |
| Deemed adjourned   | 5524       |
| <b>Erratum</b>   | 5525       |

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 11 avril 1994

|                                 |      |
|---------------------------------|------|
| <b>DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS</b> |      |
| <b>Éducation en français</b>    |      |
| M. Grandmaitre                  | 5489 |

|                              |      |
|------------------------------|------|
| <b>PÉTITIONS</b>             |      |
| <b>Éducation en français</b> |      |
| M. Grandmaitre               | 5502 |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>DEUXIÈME LECTURE</b>  |      |
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant des lois concernant la municipalité régionale d'Ottawa-Carleton et les conseils scolaires de langue française, projet de loi 143, M. Philip</b> | 5502 |
| Adoptée  | 5503 |
| <b>Loi de 1993 modifiant la Loi sur la taxe de vente au détail, projet de loi 138, M. Laughren</b>   | 5503 |
| Débat ajourné  | 5524 |



No. 111

N° 111

ISSN 1180-2987

# Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 35th Parliament

# Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature

## Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 12 April 1994

## Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mardi 12 avril 1994



Speaker  
Honourable David Warner

Président  
L'honorable David Warner

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 12 April 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 12 avril 1994

The House met at 1333.

Prayers.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS UNDERGROUND ECONOMY

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** I rise today to speak about an industry in my riding that employs a number of my constituents, namely, the makers of Bacardi rum. Those jobs, and the 10,000 other jobs that are available throughout Canada, are in jeopardy, and they're in jeopardy because of smuggling.

The smuggling takes place because the taxation of spirits in this country is so high. Nearly 83% of the price of spirits in this country, of which 60% belongs to the Bob Rae government, is put on to a bottle of spirits.

This industry, which is one that employs a number of people and certainly generates a significant amount of activity in this province, something in the neighbourhood of \$2.5 billion a year, is one that needs to be protected.

I urge the Treasurer in his upcoming budget to consider at least a minimal reduction. I'm told by sources in the Liquor Control Board of Ontario that 10% would be significant, would allow the industry to continue to compete.

When one recognizes the fact that Canadian Club, which is made in Windsor, Ontario, sells in Chicago—a litre and a half of that spirit sells for about \$15 or \$16. The equivalent price you would pay here in Ontario for that would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$50 to \$55.

One can understand with that type of taxation, that type of increase in price, why the spirits industry in this country and in this province specifically is suffering, and perhaps to the detriment of those 10,000 jobs or the jobs in this province and my riding.

## CURLING CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** Today I am pleased to pay tribute to the winners of the World Junior Women's Curling Championship. After rebounding from a 7 to 4 deficit, this Unionville team beat out the United States by 10 to 7 to claim victory at the junior curling championships in Bulgaria. The secret to their success was a combination of experience, youthful enthusiasm and a love of curling.

This solid gold team was made up of skip Kim Gellard, vice Corie Beveridge, second Lisa Savage and lead Sandy Graham. Their team was later joined in the winner's circle by Colin Davison's Edmonton team, which grabbed the junior men's title. The championship sweep was the first for Canada since 1988 and the first world junior triumph for a Canadian team since 1989.

Our community shares their excitement, having

watched them come so close in previous finals, but this team never let their losses daunt them and they continued to play and practise, honing their skills that assured them victory this year.

It is a great honour to commend these players for their hard work and love of sport and the love of their community and their country. This is a victory that is a great win for this team, it is a great win for Markham and it is a great win for Canada.

## WILSON BROOKS

**Ms Zanana L. Akande (St Andrew-St Patrick):** I rise in the House today to commemorate a great Canadian, a contributor to the Canadian culture, an educator, a historian, a veteran, a black man, a man worth knowing.

Mr Wilson Brooks was born in Windsor. He received a BA degree from the University of Toronto and a bachelor of education from the Ontario College of Education. He was a teacher, the first black principal in Ontario schools, in Toronto schools. His community leadership experiences included the Ontario Human Rights Commission, the Ontario Black History Society and the Toronto Urban Alliance on Race Relations. He was a part of the fair employment practices advisory committee and later-life learning at Innis College at the University of Toronto.

My voice and the emotion in it speaks to the fact that this was a friend. This was a person who gave a great deal to Ontario and to Canada, and yesterday this man passed away. I rise here today because we have lost a wonderful person: a leader, a Canadian, a black man who was proud of it. I wish that we all recognize his contributions and mourn his loss.

## LINHAVEN HOME FOR THE AGED

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** Health Minister Ruth Grier should heed the words of Peter Monk, president of the Linhaven Residents' Council, and family and friends of the Linhaven home in St Catharines who are urging the provincial government to restore the kind of funding to long-term care facilities that will enable the staff to provide the quality of care that is a necessity for vulnerable aged members of our society. I quote from a letter that has been directed to the minister:

"I am writing to you as a concerned and loving wife whose husband suffers from Alzheimer's disease and lives in Linhaven Home for the Aged, St Catharines, Ontario. My husband is unable to manage any aspect of his personal care without complete assistance from staff. He can no longer feed himself or tend to his most personal needs. He can no longer walk or speak. The staff attempt to attend to all aspects of his 24-hour care. Together, staff and family members struggle to couple



professional, technical care with love and compassion to give adequate care. It becomes increasingly difficult.

"My letter comes to you with an appeal to address the issue of funding cutbacks to the vulnerable elderly in our society. My concern increases daily as I watch increased staff shortages chipping away at the quality of care my husband receives.

"We must not allow this to continue. Linhaven was, in my opinion, giving excellent care to those residents living there. I now fear for the future of my husband and others."

I urge the minister to take the action urged in this letter.

1340

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** Each week innocent victims die in senseless deaths. In fact the illusion of safety for any one of us has been shattered. I have a letter here from the staff, students and faculty of Wilfrid Laurier University.

"Dear Mrs Witmer,

"As students and other members of the...university community, we are writing to you to express our shock and concern at the murder of Joan Heimbecker.... Joan was an alumna of Wilfrid Laurier. She graduated last year with honours, and was the recipient of the prestigious Governor General's Award for academic excellence. She will be sadly missed by all who knew her.

"Unfortunately, incidents like this are occurring all too frequently to Canadian women. The murder of Heimbecker by her ex-boyfriend...indicates to us one more tragic example of the extreme risk that many women face when separating from a partner. We believe all women will continue to be at risk until communities all over this country condemn the violence.

"From our government we expect tougher legislation and a zero-tolerance, hands-on commitment to ending the violence against women. We are angry that women are dying at the hands of people they once loved, and we want to put an end to the violence before there are any more tragedies to remind us that it is indeed an important issue.

"We are sending you this letter, Mrs Witmer...to ask for representation on this issue in the hopes that these concerns be brought to the House on behalf of Joan Heimbecker...."

#### ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

**Mr Pat Hayes (Essex-Kent):** I take issue with some of the statements made by the leader of the official opposition in this House last Tuesday. The honourable leader claimed that this government broke its election promise of financial assistance to farmers.

I remind the leader that during the election we promised \$50 million in immediate interest relief for the farmers in this province. In 1991 we brought in a one-year interest relief program that distributed over \$60 million to more than 12,000 farm families in Ontario.

I would add that, unlike the interest assistance programs of the previous Liberal government, we did not

hold back grants from any eligible farm family because the province happened to guarantee a bank loan to the farmer under some other program. In fact the neediest farm families never saw a penny of the money to which they were entitled under the Liberal OFFIRR program.

I take particular pride that not only did the task force consult widely, but the ministry followed up with two workshops and several working groups to which we invited various farmers, including representatives from the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario, the National Farmers Union and the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, where they took an active role in shaping the agricultural investment strategy. The agricultural investment strategy is a program devised for farmers by farmers.

It's rare indeed for the chair of a task force to see all the task force recommendations implemented so swiftly by this government. I'm very proud to have taken part in that.

#### MINISTRY RELOCATION

**Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East):** I stand to denounce the announcement made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs intending to transfer the regional Municipal Affairs office from Ottawa to Kingston.

I find it very, very strange that the minister would make such an announcement without consulting the area municipalities. We're just wondering, from where will the 11 municipalities only in Ottawa-Carleton receive their services from now on? From Kingston. I find it very strange that when you consider the population of the Ottawa-Carleton area, we deserve an office. We deserve an office right in downtown Ottawa, where it exists today. The minister has chosen, without any consultation with the members from the area or even from the minister responsible for Ottawa-Carleton, the Honourable Ms Gigantes, the Minister of Housing—no consultation.

I realize that the ministry and the government are trying to save dollars, but we would appreciate being consulted when such a major move is being made without any previous announcement. I find this minister uncooperative for the simple reason that he's been telling us that, "Hey, I'm so close to the government of Ottawa-Carleton," yet he doesn't have time to consult with its members.

#### SPORTS AND RECREATION FUNDING

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** Because of misguided priorities, sport and recreation programs in Ontario have been chronically underfunded by this NDP government. According to one group, Sport Ontario, the government has slashed funding to provincial sport and recreation organizations an average of 24%. The casualties of these cutbacks are often children who can't now afford to participate. It means poor kids can't afford to play hockey.

I have a couple of useful suggestions for the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation on this.

First, increase the share of lottery profits to sport and recreation from the unacceptable and meagre level of 8%.

Second, the Ontario Lottery Corp spent \$22 million on marketing itself last year, \$22 million to inform the public about all the worthy causes which are supported through lottery funds. What the TV ads don't say is that

sport and recreation's allocation is only 8% of the lottery corporation's total profits. Why not take that money that you're spending on marketing and instead spend it on recreation programs themselves?

The minister should take to heart the following comments taken from one of the many letters I have received from people concerned about the future of sport and recreation. Steve Thompson, a constituent of mine from Drayton who is a board member of the Ontario Water Ski Association, writes:

"Another cut in funding for sport, combined with reductions in transfers to municipalities, could result in the collapse of the sport system Ontario has built since 1974. And that will leave Ontario a drastically poorer place."

#### GUELPH INTERNATIONAL RESOURCE CENTRE

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** Recently, the Guelph International Resource Centre held an international development fair. The theme was "Together we can make a world of difference."

I was impressed with many local groups who displayed information about their work in Canada and in developing countries, such as Amnesty International, the El Salvador Project, Guelph Africa Network, Guelph-Jinja Project, which is a municipal twinning project with Uganda, Ontario Worker Co-op Federation, Red Cross Save the Children Canada, a lot of groups.

Guelph's reputation in international work is well known across Canada and around the world. Through many community organizations and the University of Guelph, we have links around the world through overseas projects, partnerships and volunteer work.

Guelph International Resource Centre, or GIRC as it is known, is an umbrella group which networks with community organizations in international development and education.

At this event there were a lot of volunteers who talked about their experiences in working overseas. They learned at first hand of the challenges that developing countries face each day. This opened their eyes to the obscene and shameful waste of valuable resources that wealthy countries take for granted.

They also learned that while Canadians are materially wealthy, we are sometimes comparatively poorer than communities in developing countries in terms of spiritual, cultural, family and community work.

After they saw the entire communities pull together, I think the message of "Together we can make a world of difference" is one that we can all learn from.

#### VISITOR

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to join me in welcoming to our chamber this afternoon, seated in the members' gallery west, the former member for Brantford, Mr David Neumann. Welcome.

It is now time for oral questions.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: As you are aware, each day

the business of the day of this place is printed by the government, titled "Business for" and then the day. I'd like to raise I guess perhaps more a point of privilege than order in relationship to a number of my colleagues, particularly those from the Ottawa community, who yesterday, along with myself, were somewhat surprised to find that a bell began ringing for a vote, a five-minute bell on second reading of Bill 143.

It has been customary and a matter of courtesy for the government House leader for the government of the day to ensure that members in this place receive notice of the business that is to transpire. In yesterday's orders of the day, the business for Monday, April 11, there was no mention of this vote being called. There was no mention in any way whatsoever. A number of members of my caucus, and we have a large representation from the Ottawa area, were not available, were not aware, were taken totally by surprise, I can only assume through a mistake, unless someone from the Ottawa area had some influence on the decision. That's entirely possible.

1350

#### *Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mr Mahoney:** But it seems to me, Mr Speaker, that having had the government House leader surprise and spring the time allocation motion on this place with no discussion among House leaders, which is also customary, to then spring a surprise of calling a vote on second reading with no notification will only lead to the rather intemperate attitudes that seem to occur in this place from time to time.

I would just like to raise to you, sir, on behalf of all my colleagues but particularly those from Ottawa, for whom Bill 143 is a very major contentious piece of legislation—

#### *Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** Would the member for Durham East come to order, please.

**Mr Mahoney:** —that for the government House leader to spring a surprise vote with five minutes' notice in this place on a bill of such impact and import in the Ottawa community, where the entire structure of the municipal government is being realigned in that community, and not to afford the opportunity for my colleagues, sir, to be here to vote on that was totally uncalled for. I think that the government House leader, at the very least, owes this House an apology for that action.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** For the member opposite, I do apologize for having neglected—because he is correct. I did neglect to mention Bill 143 in my business statement on last Thursday evening for this week. However, members opposite should know that we did discuss this matter at the House leaders' meeting with both of the opposition parties last Thursday, and it was clear that the second reading vote had to happen today so that the committee could start on Wednesday. That is precisely what is occurring. The committee had been informed to make its preparations for dealing with the bill in committee starting this Wednesday.



I apologize for having neglected to have mentioned the bill in my business statement, but there was discussion of this matter last Thursday with both of the opposition House leaders.

**The Speaker:** To the member for Mississauga West and to the government House leader: First, I appreciate the matter that the member has brought to my attention. Indeed, he is right that things run more smoothly in here when there is good communication among the three parties. When there are surprises, then it makes it difficult to maintain a civil atmosphere in which to conduct public business.

The government House leader has apologized for neglecting to include the item on the business paper. The member will know that, unfortunately, as far as he is concerned, there is no point of order. Everything was done properly yesterday. However, a courtesy should have been extended, and it was not. I trust that every effort is always made to ensure that every courtesy possible will be extended to all three parties.

#### SENECA COLLEGE CAMPUS

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Just a brief point of order, Mr Speaker: Earlier this morning, I attended a news conference at which the Premier and the Minister of Education and Training were present and in which they made what I consider to be an extremely important announcement concerning the building of a new campus of Seneca College at York University entitled Seneca at York.

If you'll just bear with me for a moment, sir, had the government done the appropriate thing and made an announcement here in ministers' statements, I would have been prepared to stand up and congratulate the government on it and remind the government that the final package would require a subway at York University as well.

I'm wondering, sir, under the order of ministers' statement, why in the world the Minister of Education wouldn't have shared that announcement with the members of the House at some point today, appropriately under ministers' statements.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member will know he does not have a point of order. However, I'm sure that his words of congratulations are appreciated by the minister.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** I wondered where Bob Rae was. I thought he was out driving that expensive Swiss car of his on Preston Manning's expense account. I'm glad to know that he's up, I'm sure, with the member for Yorkview, who must be happy about that announcement today.

At any rate, my first question is to the Minister of Social Services—1,500 bucks a day for a Swiss car. Boy, I'll tell you, my—anyway, my question is to the Minister of Social Services. I want to follow up with the minister on the discussion that my leader was having with him in this place yesterday about the problems with social assistance in this province. The minister and his govern-

ment have routinely told the Legislature and the province how it is that they are going to fix this system, and it is quite clear from the data that my leader presented yesterday that the system is broken.

Minister, you took some pains yesterday to say that the backlog in hearing appeals at the Social Assistance Review Board was, in fact, not what was indicated. I have in my hands a ministry document provided to me today which indicates that the average length of time it now takes to get a decision from the Social Assistance Review Board, the provincial panel that decides these matters, is 154 days. That is nearly eight months.

Would you not agree that that evidence alone clearly indicates that your system at the board is broken, and because it is broken it is costing the hard-pressed taxpayers of Ontario tens of millions of additional dollars that need not be spent?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** We could all, I guess, attribute ownership of the system to whomever we'd like, I suppose, depending on who's in government at any particular point in time, but I think the member would, in his heart of hearts, know that in fact the problems that we have in the system are not problems that have just started in the last few years.

I think we indeed agree that there are problems that need to be fixed, and the problem that he particularly pointed to with respect to the Social Assistance Review Board is one of those. He quoted correctly from the memo that he received indicating that 154 working days is the average time. That's about seven to eight months, when you count in the weekend times in there, and that, some may think, is longer than we would like it to be. I believe it's longer than we would like it to be.

There have been, I can tell the member, some increases recently in the social assistance case load in terms of the Social Assistance Review Board as a result of some changes that have been made, and that's something that we are looking at. I think that we can make some improvements, and I've talked with the chair of the Social Assistance Review Board around some possibilities, both with respect to some of the appointment issues that we are going through now and with respect to some of the procedures. I think that there can be improvements made that will reduce the time lines that are there. These are things that we are working on doing.

**Mr Conway:** There isn't a knowledgeable person in this province who wouldn't agree that this appeal system of yours is punishingly and expensively unacceptable. Let me cite two other data.

According to the information provided by your department to me today, only 33.6% of the cases that go to appeal are in fact granted. We know that under this system you can claim benefits until those decisions are made. So we're paying out millions of dollars to people who are not going to be approved by the appeal board. You know that: 33.6% of those at appeal are granted.

Secondly, you mention previous governments. Well, when the other government was last in office the number of appeals was approximately 4,200 annually. In the year

just ended, the number of appeals annually went to 13,000.

I say to you, do not these data make plain that your system is broken, it's hurting legitimate recipients in this system, and it is crucifying the taxpayer? You have promised to fix it—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place his question, please.

**Mr Conway:** —and you have not done so. Will you, Minister, today indicate what steps you're going to take that you have not taken to fix this mess?

1400

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I'm sorry that I'm not just not up to responding with the same kind of volume that the member opposite decides to ask his question today. Let me just put a few more facts on the table which may actually address the point that I think he's making.

One of those is that I think the member should know better than to conclude that because only 33% of appeals are granted, therefore that means everybody else is receiving assistance during that time, because the reality is that about half of the people who file an appeal receive interim assistance. We need to compare the right figures here.

Secondly, who could argue with statistics? It's quite correct that the number of appeals have increased during the last three years, but compare those to the tremendous increase in the case load and I think you would find that they are not out of whack. In fact, I can tell the honourable member and members of the Legislature that the Social Assistance Review Board has taken a number of steps to improve the delivery of decisions and the speed with which it renders decisions.

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** Like what?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** One example that I can cite is in going from three-person panels to one-person panels. That's something that's happened in the last couple of years, and it's directly as a result of steps that have been taken, supported by this government, by the social assistance board to better manage its case load.

There's no denying that there's more work that can be done to continue to improve the situation there, and we're working on that right now.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** Let me give you some examples of a system out of whack, of your bungling the job.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy and Minister Responsible for Native Affairs):** Oh, come on.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Murphy:** No, no. I'll give you some examples: An overpayment of \$3,000 to one individual which will take eight and a half years to pay back; an overpayment of \$4,400 which will take 12 years to pay back; an overpayment of \$4,000 which will take 16 and a half years to pay back; and my unfortunate favourite, an overpayment of \$7,000 which at \$10 a month will take

58 years to pay back. And why is that? Because the case load, for example, at one of the welfare offices in my riding, for each case worker has doubled while you've been in charge of the ministry.

There is no way they can do a good job with the resources you're giving them. Instead of hiring 270 for after the fact, why don't you fix it up front? Why don't you help make sure that the people who deserve the assistance get the job right, and what are you going to do to fix the bungling job you're doing with the welfare administration?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** It's really hard to resist. Members across, particularly the Liberal members, have a lot of gall in talking about the issue of overpayments when, as I pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, it wasn't until the NDP became the government that there was even any central tracking of the amount of overpayments, and it was specifically under the Liberal government that they decentralized the system to such a point where nobody even knew what was going on in the system, by and large.

We are taking hold of the system. We are trying to get better control over what is going on. We're going to continue to do that, and I would also say to any of the Liberal members, particularly across the way, that if they have a real interest in working with this government to fix the very significant problems that we believe and they agree exist in the system, I would suggest they spend some of that energy in talking to their local MPs and help us to deal with the funding problems that are getting in the way of us doing the kind of fundamental changes that we would like to be able to do.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Would the member place his second question, please.

**Mr Conway:** I don't want to tease the bears, Mr Speaker.

I have a second question. You ought to listen to some of the interjections from the Minister of Housing. She is offending every sensibility that the Attorney General has brought to this legislative debate. I'm just trying to play by Marion's rules, you know. Boy, if I accused anybody of foaming at the mouth, wouldn't I be in the bad books.

**The Speaker:** Could the member please place his second question.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** My question to the Minister of Health: Last week my colleagues Mr Elston and Mr Micalash raised with you in this House their concerns about an ongoing problem all across rural Ontario, in southern and northern Ontario, and that is the maintenance of adequate medical services at emergency departments in those community hospitals.

My colleague the member for Kenora is going to rise shortly and tell you that the situation at Red Lake is not fixed, that in fact the 6,000 people, residents of Ontario, who pay a very considerable level of tax to support a public health care system, cannot be guaranteed that at certain times of the day or week when they now go to their community hospital in that part of northern Ontario,



they are in fact going to be able to access a physician at that emergency department.

Minister, what are you doing, as Minister of Health, given your leadership responsibilities, to ensure that at Red Lake and everywhere else across the province the people of Ontario are going to know and be guaranteed that they will have access at all times to the adequate number of physicians in their emergency departments at those community hospitals?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** I'm glad the member acknowledges that this is a problem all across the province and it has been for quite some time, as governments of all stripes have struggled with how to get physicians to the underserved areas, and especially how in those areas physicians who are paid on the basis of fee for service can be assured that there will be sufficient remuneration for them to continue to carry out the functions that they have historically provided.

As the member says, the taxpayers of Red Lake pay their taxes, and we the taxpayers contribute significantly for the 6,000 people in Red Lake. There's over \$4 million of a hospital and over \$1 million in billings by five doctors. Those five doctors and that hospital are there, and I consider that is sufficient to provide the care for the people of Red Lake.

I profoundly regret that because of an argument with the physicians over how they are paid and how much money they are paid, those physicians have stopped providing on-call services to the emergency room. What our ministry has been doing, what the medical association and the Ontario Hospital Association have been doing, what the College of Physicians and Surgeons has been doing is meeting with those physicians and attempting to remind them of their professional responsibilities and, on the other hand, to negotiate with them about an alternative method of payment that will allow them to continue to fulfil the responsibilities they have to the 6,000 people of Red Lake.

**Mr Conway:** We're all aware that there are committees, there are joint committees, there are task forces, there are good intentions. I even have in my hand a very clear and declaratory press release, in the name of the Minister of Health, dated but two and a half weeks ago, March 25, in which you make a solemn and unequivocal commitment to the people of Red Lake that you will do whatever it takes to provide at all times a minimal level of service.

Minister, two and a half weeks after you made that commitment it is not being lived up to, and it's not just a problem in Red Lake; it is a real problem in communities like Goderich and Wingham and Mindemoya and Newbury and Deep River and Barry's Bay and scores of other communities across this province.

My question remains: What, as the leader of the ministry in this government, are you prepared to do to live up to your commitment of just two and a half weeks ago to ensure that in all of those communities I've named and scores that I have not named, the people of this province will know and can be guaranteed that when, at 11 o'clock at night on a Thursday or at 4 o'clock on a Saturday afternoon in Newbury or Red Lake or Barry's

Bay, Ontario, the patient walks in or is brought in by ambulance to those emergency departments, there will be an emergency physician available?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** Let me tell the member what this government has done to try and address a very long-standing problem. What we have done is to negotiate, with the profession and the Ontario Medical Association, an agreement with respect to the provision of services to the people of this province, an agreement that provides for almost \$4 billion in funding to the province's 20,000 physicians.

Having negotiated that agreement last year, having had that agreement ratified by the Ontario Medical Association, we now find a number of physicians in emergency rooms in small hospitals saying, "We want extra funding over and above what was negotiated for us." That is something that we are prepared to talk about within the pool of funding available to the Ontario Medical Association. We don't think it makes any sense for people who are serving in emergency rooms to be paid per patient. We would much rather pay them on some different basis so that they would feel it was worth their while to be on call.

Let me remind the member, however, that with respect to many of these hospitals, a patient brought in did not necessarily find a doctor waiting for them even in the palmy days of his government; they found a doctor on call willing to respond to an emergency. That is a physician's responsibility, and that is the kind of responsibility I hope the physicians of Red Lake will continue to uphold.

1410

**Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora):** Mr Speaker, you will know that I have stood in this House on various occasions—one really comes to memory—demanding that we have adequate medical services for my constituents in the Red Lake area. I was pleased to go back to see what the minister had said some three weeks ago, when she indicated to me in this House that there would be adequate medical services in Red Lake.

My colleague referred to the minister's press release, and I would just like to quote from that press release. This is from your office, Minister: "We will make sure that, if necessary, other doctors are in Red Lake on March 31 to maintain hospital service," said Mrs Grier.

Second quote: "Ministry staff have made arrangements to fly doctors into Red Lake if necessary."

As of March 31, there has not been that adequate service in Red Lake. We have had two replacement doctors, for a total of 72 hours over 12 days. To me, that is not adequate medical service in Red Lake. As of 7 o'clock last Saturday morning, there was no doctor in Red Lake to cover for emergency medical services.

We cannot leave this in the hands of the OMA. We cannot leave this in the hands of the OHA. You are responsible for medical services in Red Lake, and I must ask you, why are you not living up to that responsibility and ensuring that my constituents of Red Lake have adequate emergency services provided to them?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** As minister, I am responsible for

managing a very complex and very complicated system. Responsibility for providing medical services is shared between the medical profession, the hospital and the ministry, which pays the bills.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** You buy a plane ticket and you fly them in. It's not complicated.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Mississauga West.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** Let me say to the member that there are five doctors in Red Lake. There is a 22-bed hospital in Red Lake. In the week between the 4th and the 11th, there have been two emergency calls in Red Lake. One was dealt with at the hospital; one was stabilized and evacuated, as are many of those emergencies.

But I share the member's concern and I share his anger that doctors who have a responsibility to provide services either have stayed in Red Lake and refused to provide them or have not been willing to go to Red Lake.

I can assure him that I have asked the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, which has the responsibility for looking at the actions of what is a self-regulating profession, to examine the actions of the physicians in Red Lake and to assure me that in fact those physicians have lived up to their responsibilities, and to examine the state of care that is being provided in Red Lake. That is how physicians have to exercise their responsibility, and I'm looking forward to the report of the college.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Two weeks ago the member for Wellington and I raised examples in Wellington county of interim welfare assistance being abused, of millions of dollars being wasted. I indicated two weeks ago to you, Minister, that it was taking the review board six, eight, 10 and 12 months' time to render decisions.

I would like to quote back what you told me two weeks ago. You said, "I've had this discussion very directly with the chair of the Social Assistance Review Board—that they in fact have managed their workload down to the point where decisions are being rendered in a matter of weeks." You said, "I would ask the leader of the third party to update his information."

Today you acknowledge that the average is eight months, exactly as I told you two weeks ago. Can you tell me why, in your direct consultations with the chairman of the board, you were told or you understood a matter of weeks, and two weeks later you now acknowledge and confirm that I was right in the beginning, that it is eight months? Can you explain that discrepancy in what you told the House two weeks ago and today?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I don't think there's an inconsistency. In fact, in many instances the board is able to make decisions very quickly, in a number of weeks. I think it's quite correct. If I in any way misled the honourable member in an earlier response, I apologize for that, but I think the facts are what they are, and there is on average the eight-

month period that's there in the figures.

Having said that, I can also tell the member that the board has significantly increased and improved its ability to render decisions from what it used to be before. In fact, they doubled the number of cases they were able to deal with during the 1993 period alone. So there have been improvements, but, as I said earlier, there's no denying that there is more that needs to be done.

**Mr Harris:** The fact of the matter is, your quoted statements from two weeks ago and your statements today are in direct conflict with one another. The fact of the matter is, you don't have a clue what's going on, not a clue. Social workers are bringing cases to your attention. They're writing you letters which you don't even respond to.

Two weeks ago we raised the cases of many 16- and 17-year-olds who have figured out how to beat the system. Today, when you were asked about the dramatic increase in the number of people getting interim assistance, you came back and said, "Well, the number of cases is up," which is another indictment of your disastrous economic policy, by the way.

Can you explain this to me? The number of cases have doubled since you took office in the last three years—bad enough—but the number of interim welfare assistance cases has quadrupled over the same period of time. If it isn't because 16- and 17-year-olds have figured out how to beat the system, can you explain why there are now more than twice as many on interim assistance as there are on full-time assistance?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I think the leader of the third party should be a little wary and not try to blame all the problems we have in the system—and I agree that there are many problems in the system—on the 8,100 16- and 17-year-olds who are receiving social assistance, because that's the number. He well knows that we have 1.3 million people in the province on social assistance, and to blame all those problems on 8,100 young people I think is stretching even his version of the truth.

I could stand here and recite from charts I have that show very clearly the workload and the case loads and what has been happening. In the 12-month period that ended in February of this year, the appeals received by the board were just under 11,000. When you compare that with the huge increase in case load, I don't think that's out of line with what the historical pattern has been. That doesn't mean it's an acceptable level; it means there is more work that needs to be done, but that's something we are doing.

I've indicated specifically to the member and to other members who have asked this question that on the issue of assistance, both interim and ongoing, as it relates to 16- and 17-year-olds, we acknowledge that there are some things that need to be done there. We are working on tightening up the guidelines that are issued—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** —and that they're available to people, because we think that's an area where there is in fact some more work that needs to be done.



1420

**Mr Harris:** The fact is, Minister, that nobody believes your statistics any more. They're not believable.

We're not suggesting that this will solve all the problems. The only way we're going to do that is to replace you entirely as a government. Then we can get at solving all the problems. But there is one specific problem that could be solved. Today the *Globe and Mail* reported a similar situation to the ones the member for Wellington and I raised two weeks ago. A 17-year-old, safely living at home, was awarded a year's worth of benefits just by launching an appeal.

Would you agree with me that to solve this one problem, if we could take a few of the dollars that are being frittered away—just a few of the dollars being frittered way—and speed up the appeal process to a matter of weeks, as you said it was, there wouldn't be any need for interim assistance at all? Would you agree with me that that would be a commonsense, straightforward solution that would save millions of dollars spent on interim welfare? Put a few of those into the appeal system and it would ensure a more compassionate and more effective way of delivering welfare. Will you do that?

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I don't know how many times I need to say to the member that I agree there are improvements like that that can be made. I also want to say to him that in fact it's our view and our intent to go even further than that. We think we need to continue to improve and speed up the appeal process, but we also think that in an area such as the question of 16- and 17-year-olds, there is some tightening up of the rules, as I indicated earlier in the House, that we need to do and that that will also respond to that particular situation.

The leader of the third party began his last supplementary with a reference fact that the only solution here is really a change of government. I want to say to him, as I said to my Liberal friends earlier, that he knows full well—I think he knows full well—that what we have been trying to do is grapple with difficulties that have been there historically for many years but which clearly have been accentuated during the last three to four years, a period during which a party he represents was the government in Ottawa, which has resulted in a significant decrease in terms of the amount of funding we get, from 50-cent dollars to 29-cent dollars in Ontario compared to other provinces. That's something he can't get away from as being part of the reality of the system we have today.

**Mr Harris:** What you have done, Minister, is to prove you're incapable of grappling with this problem, along with many other problems. You are incapable.

#### GUN CONTROL

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My second question is to the Solicitor General. There has been much debate in the last few weeks about gun control, about tougher penalties for criminals. As you know, Minister, our caucus put forward our recommendations in these areas in *New Directions*, Volume Three. But while the federal gun control debate goes on and continues and likely will continue for years, there is something positive

that I believe we can do today.

Several American cities have put in place a guns-for-goods program. People can exchange weapons for grocery vouchers, for concert and sports tickets, and cash, no questions asked. To help get guns off our streets today, will you spearhead a similar program for the province of Ontario?

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** Let me say to the honourable member first of all that I appreciate the fact that he begins his question with a constructive recommendation on the same issue—that is the second time; we had one from the official opposition, and I think it says a great deal about the quality of the members in the House, who are prepared to face an issue like this in that light. Let me try to respond in a similar fashion by indicating to the honourable member that should he or anyone else have a proposal they feel would assist us in making our streets safer, particularly as they relate to the control of guns that cause so much destruction, certainly I would be very prepared to consider and review any such proposal.

**Mr Harris:** In the guns-for-goods programs last year, 1,300 guns were collected in four months in Boston; in Hennepin county, Minnesota, 6,200 guns were turned in in just seven days. I don't pretend that this effort alone will rid our streets of weapons, but I do believe it would be a positive first step, and it's one that can start today. It costs taxpayers nothing. It will involve Ontarians of all ages in preventing crime. It could bring communities together by including the police, church groups, educators, sports celebrities, local merchants.

Solicitor General, based upon the results of similar programs, I ask you to endorse this call. Will you join with us and implement such a program today?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** I believe I've already indicated my willingness to consider and review such a proposal, and if there's any possibility that the benefits would be as strong here as they have been in other jurisdictions, my answer to that is, indeed, let's do whatever will make a difference, particularly things that happen right away.

Let me say two quick things while I'm on my feet. One is that I also endorse the comment of the honourable member that this one effort alone won't do it. I think he acknowledges that no one effort will, that there needs to be a combination of efforts on the whole issue of crime prevention. I believe his report says that also.

Let me also indicate to members of the House that the federal Justice ministry has indicated they are forming a federal working group on gun smuggling—we've received correspondence from them on this—and that I will be signalling to the federal government our participation through the OPP, specifically through the chief provincial firearms officer, and will continue to work with them on any—any—measure that would help to make the streets of Ontario as safe as we would all like them to be.

**Mr Harris:** I appreciate the comments by the Solicitor General. I would say in response to the comments about another task force that the Liberals are the masters

at setting up task forces, study groups, look-ats: delay, postpone. We know that. They've proven that provincially, federally, wherever they've been given an opportunity, unfortunately, to govern.

What I am proposing today doesn't require a task force or a study. It's pretty simple, it's pretty straightforward, it's pretty basic. You would be aware that just this weekend a Toronto man offered \$200 to the first kid who turned in a gun. Given that safety in our streets is an issue that brings everyone together, an opportunity to do something positive outside of implementing all the recommendations in New Directions, Volume Three, and what the federal government can do, I ask you this: Will you sit down with me after question period today so that tomorrow we can launch an Ontario program that will have as its core a guns-for-goods program? No study, no task force, no bureaucracy: You and I will settle it today and announce it tomorrow. Will you do that?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** You were doing real good up until then, Mike. The honourable member started out with some very constructive suggestions. I think that's the way to deal with this, and I tried to respond in kind. We dealt with a couple of other issues in the supplementary, and I think now he's starting to cross the line in terms of what is realistic.

I'm prepared to meet as quickly as possible if he's got some actual material, to give us a chance to look at it, but I do believe that people watching here today would suggest that it's just a tad bit of grandstanding to suggest that we would just go behind the chairs and cut a quick deal and that's how we're going to prevent crime in the province of Ontario. I just don't think that's the reality.

Let me also say that in terms of the federal Liberals being good at task forces, I'm surprised the honourable member would say that, because there's a renowned report called Crime Prevention in Canada, 12th report of the standing committee on justice and the Solicitor General, headed by the Tories: a well-known report, a good report, one which we endorse and which we're working with the current federal government to work on implementing.

#### VIDEO LOTTERY TERMINALS

**Mr Carman McClelland (Brampton North):** My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Minister, you've stated in the past very clearly that you and your government are opposed to video lottery terminals, VLTs. We know, in terms of your so-called policy in the past, that you were opposed to casinos. In fact, you called it a matter of conviction; your Minister of Finance called it a matter of principle. You abandoned that for the sake of the gambler's dollar. So it's not a great deal of assurance for people to understand where you're coming from when you say that you are opposed to VLTs.

What is your position, Minister, and the position of your government with respect to the introduction of video lottery terminals in the province of Ontario? I might add that we know the Premier, and his good friend and de facto campaign manager, Mr Agnew, is in favour of it, but what is your position and the official position of the government, and can we count on that position?

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** When we announced that there would be a pilot project, a casino in Windsor, we said at that time that there would be VLTs in the casino itself in Windsor, and that is the policy of the government.

1430

**Mr McClelland:** Thank you, Minister, but I'm afraid you haven't answered the question. We understand what your position is with respect to VLTs in a commercial casino. What is your position today and what kind of assurance can you give us that your position will remain as such, frankly, more than a few days, because we know how rapidly it can change, with respect to the introduction of video lottery terminals in locations other than commercial casinos in the province of Ontario? It's not a difficult question. We understand there's divisiveness in your own cabinet. But understanding that, tell us how that's been resolved and what side you come down on.

**Hon Ms Churley:** I believe that was the same question repeated and my answer is exactly the same. I presume that although he hasn't referred to it, he is referring to a study that was recently reported on—done by I forget who, but not this government—that did some studies on the opinion of people across Ontario as to their feelings about VLTs. I presume that's what he's getting at. We certainly have not changed our position on VLTs in the province of Ontario. I've already said that, and I say it again.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** My question is for the Minister of Health. Minister, you have not only broken your promise to fix the problems with emergency room coverage in Red Lake but you have in fact made the situation worse.

On April 7 you wrote a letter to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario asking it to inquire into the state of medical practice in Red Lake. This written request was followed by a verbal request for the college to investigate allegations made by officials in your ministry that a locum physician was harassed by Red Lake physicians during his Easter weekend placement at the Margaret Cochenour hospital in Red Lake. The locum, Dr Benjamin Chan, says in a letter that this allegation of harassment is totally untrue.

Given that there is no factual basis for this investigation, I ask you, who from your ministry asked the College of Physicians and Surgeons to investigate this charge of harassment and what prompted this request?

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** The College of Physicians and Surgeons has been asked by me, in a written letter, to investigate the state of medical care in Red Lake and to assure itself, as the responsible body, and me that in fact there is no risk to the public in Red Lake. Any additional conversations that members of my ministry may have had, and I'm not aware of them, with the College of Physicians and Surgeons I can assure the member are not part of the referral and the request that I made to the CPSO, and I have no comment on them.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** I suggest the minister get a grip on her ministry. Your ministry's hidden agenda, and I



believe this minister's hidden agenda, with respect to this issue is to blame the doctors, to blame the hospitals, to blame the Ontario Medical Association. Everyone's to blame for the lack of emergency room coverage in rural Ontario except this minister. The people of rural Ontario don't buy that approach to this issue at all. In fact, this posturing could have tragic consequences for Red Lake and for rural communities all across this province.

In your letter to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Minister, you state that your ministry is continuing to try and find locum physicians for Red Lake, but nowhere does Red Lake show up on the Ministry of Health's April 1994 list of communities that require respite or urgent local services. Nowhere on the list is Red Lake mentioned.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** While you continue to say one thing and do another, the OMA and the Ontario Hospital Association are proposing solutions to this problem. Your inability to manage the health care system is having a profound effect, not only on Red Lake—

**The Speaker:** Would the member please place a question.

**Mr Jim Wilson:** —but on other communities like Wawa, Dryden, Kenora, Terrace Bay, Chapleau, Hearst and Newbury, to name just a few.

**The Speaker:** Does the member have a question?

**Mr Jim Wilson:** My question to the minister: At what point are you going to stop blaming physicians and hospitals and begin to address a crisis that has paralysed Red Lake and that has serious consequences for all communities in Ontario?

**Hon Mrs Grier:** I'm amazed at the member's lack of understanding; in fact, I don't believe he has a lack of understanding of how the health care system in this province operates.

I want to say to the member that I take very seriously the situation in Red Lake and in all of those other communities, and that's precisely why the constructive response of, for example, the Ontario Hospital Association, which has been helping to try to negotiate a solution to this around the province, and the OMA—

**Mr Jim Wilson:** When was the last time you actually talked to somebody in Red Lake? I went to school with Ben Chan. I know Ben Chan.

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for Simcoe West, come to order.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** We set up a committee last fall to attempt to deal with this crisis, not on a specific town area but because we recognized it was a problem all across the province.

I don't think pointing fingers and casting blame is the way to resolve it. I think all parties responsible—the OMA, the OHA and the ministry—have to work together to resolve it and I profoundly regret that the Ontario Medical Association withdrew from that committee and obviously does not see the need for it to be part of the solution.

The OHA made a proposal some weeks ago to facilitate a solution in Red Lake. We agreed and asked the OMA to agree to that. We have not had a response and that's why the college, as the responsible body—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** —has been asked by me to investigate and to assure the people of Red Lake—

**Mr Jim Wilson:** That's no way to negotiate. You're accusing the members of harassment. I wouldn't sit at the table with you.

**The Speaker:** The member for Simcoe West, please come to order.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** —that their health care is not at risk. That's what matters, not who to blame.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister please conclude her response.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** What matters is that people in Red Lake get the care they need. That's my responsibility.

#### SENECA COLLEGE CAMPUS

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** My question's to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Minister, in Yorkview today, it's not a very pleasant day. We are saddened that we're not going to get the major and the main campus over at Jane and Finch in terms of your announcement today at the Newnham Campus, the Seneca College campus. Quite frankly, Minister, my community has pretty much sent me here today to give you a very loud message, that being, of course, that they're not happy with your decision and that the appropriate place for the Seneca College campus would have been Jane and Finch.

Minister, of those on social assistance in my community, 65% are single parents. As you know, when the discussions started a number of years ago and the hope of getting a Seneca College campus at Jane and Finch was being talked about, it was my hope that we could get some of these people and these recipients off welfare, off social assistance, and do it right at Jane and Finch.

Minister, my community has relayed this particular message to you time and time again.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place a question, please.

**Mr Mammoliti:** You have not responded, in their opinion, and they are quite saddened at that fact and quite mad at you, and quite frankly they're not that pleased.

**The Speaker:** Would the member please place a question.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Minister, why? Why York University? Why not Jane and Finch? There was ample space at Jane and Finch. Why York University? Why does my community feel like it's been shrugged off by you?

**Hon David S. Cooke (Minister of Education and Training):** I know the interest the member has in this particular issue and I do understand; I've met with people from the Jane-Finch community. I understand very clearly the desire that community had to have the main campus in the Jane-Finch area.

There was a study that was commissioned by my

predecessor that looked at all the options. It came down to a number of very practical concerns, one of them being really exciting: that for the first time in our nation, we will have a college and a university sharing a campus, sharing services, recognizing credits and having the synergies of a community college and a university together that, in our belief, will increase accessibility for working people and for low-income people, and that is a first in Canada that we are proud of.

There are also some practical concerns. The site at the Jane-Finch area was \$40 million for 24 acres; at York University, \$15 million for 50 acres. There are some realities like this that we also have to consider.

1440

**Mr Mammoliti:** You met with some individuals yesterday, but it wasn't to ask them their opinion in my community; it was to tell them that their hope was dead, it was to tell them that we weren't going to get the main campus at Jane and Finch and it was to tell them that the decision had been made. Quite frankly, the decision at York is and was yours and you've made it, and it is a first and I must agree with you there.

But what about all those hundreds of people who I thought and we thought would get off the social assistance system by having a Seneca College campus pretty much right next door, where those single parents could take their children with them in the morning and get off the system, quite frankly? That's what we were hoping for and that's not what we got. What we did get was a learning centre. I'm not going to criticize the learning centre because at this point I have no choice, obviously, but to work with the learning centre.

My supplementary question to you, and I certainly would like some sort of a commitment here today, recognizing that the main campus is dead at this point—

**The Speaker:** Would the member place his question, please.

**Mr Mammoliti:** —will you meet with me and with my community to talk about the courses and the dos and don'ts of the learning centre and the wants and the needs of the community when we talk about the new learning centre, and will you do that relatively soon? For my community, this is now very important.

**Hon Mr Cooke:** Part of the process for the community learning centre, which is going to be an 18,000-square-foot facility that will offer not only training and retraining programs, but post-secondary programs as well in the Jane-Finch community—the precise definition or decision on the programs has not been made yet because the college and the university have committed themselves to working directly with the community.

Anything that my office can do—I talked to the president of the university and the college today about the process. We will set up an advisory committee, we will work with the university, the college and of course the local member in order to determine the programs that need to be in the Jane-Finch community, which I think will provide the accessibility that is so absolutely essential to the people living in that part of Metropolitan Toronto.

#### WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY AGENCY

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** To the Minister of Labour: Last week I raised the question of the decision by the Workplace Health and Safety Agency to merge three agencies currently, or in the past, delivering health and safety training in the community. They are the Care-Givers of Ontario Safety and Health Association, the College, University and School Safety Council of Ontario and the Tourism and Hospitality Industry Health and Safety Education Program.

A number of people have contacted me about this decision. I've been contacted by colleagues. The former minister, the Honourable Hugh O'Neil, the member for Quinte, has been contacted by people in the tourism industry to express a lot of concern. My office has received a number of calls expressing outrage at this unilateral decision.

I also have in front of me a legal opinion from the firm of Baker and McKenzie, barristers and solicitors, here in the city of Toronto. They report on the five issues:

"The health and safety agency does not have the authority to unilaterally withdraw funds. The agency does not have the authority to order the board of safety associations to reach consensus. The agency does not have the jurisdiction to direct future decisions in those agencies." Further, "It does not have the authority to order the directors of these agencies to merge." Finally, "The course of conduct of the agency, as we understand it, clearly indicates that the agency has not discharged the duty of fairness which is owed to these three training agencies."

Minister, they have violated your own legislation. Will you ask the board of the Workplace Health and Safety Agency to revisit the issue and reopen the negotiations with these three safety associations that have a right to continue doing what they've been doing so well for many years?

**Hon Bob Mackenzie (Minister of Labour):** In direct response to the request of the member opposite, the answer is no.

**Mr Mahoney:** Minister, by answering that, you are condoning the fact that your own health and safety agency is actually violating the law. Minister, don't shake your head. Let me read it for you. This is under the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

Point number one: "The associations" that I'm referring to "formed under section 123 of the Workers' Compensation Act" before the coming into force of this section, "except for the Farm Safety Association Inc, are continued under the authority of the agency."

It says very clearly, and it's substantiated and backed up by a legal opinion in writing, Minister, that these agencies are to continue under the act.

It then says: "The Workers' Compensation Board shall continue to make payments and grants to and on behalf of the associations referred to in this section as if section 123 of the Workers' Compensation Act...continued to apply to the associations."

Minister, your answer suggests that you condone the



fact that the Workplace Health and Safety Agency unilaterally has violated not only the spirit of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, but has actually violated the letter of the law.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member place his question, please.

**Mr Mahoney:** How can a minister of the crown condone an agency of this government breaking the law, Minister? We demand that you instruct the Workplace Health and Safety Agency to reopen this issue—

**The Speaker:** The member has placed his question.

**Hon Mr Mackenzie:** The member can demand all he wants. I don't intend to do it.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

#### ANTI-TOBACCO LEGISLATION

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. I'm not sure she heard me.

Minister, when a cabinet colleague brings in legislation, do you and your ministry get involved in assessing the economic and job loss or gain implications of the initiative? Assuming the answer is yes, what role do you play around the cabinet table if the job loss implications are very significant to this province?

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** Mr Speaker, because I've had advance warning of this question and understand that it relates to a bill that is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Health, I'm going to transfer the question to her.

**Mr Runciman:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: This question is dealing with jobs and that minister's role and I will not accept a referral. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the Minister of Health, absolutely nothing.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The Chair knows nothing about advance warnings, but the question did seem to be a question about economics and was a request of the minister to respond to economic decisions that are reached at the cabinet table. If the minister feels that's not within her responsibility, then of course she can refer the question, but there are supplementaries allowed. The minister may wish to reconsider her—

**Hon Ms Lankin:** I appreciate the Speaker's comments. I have received advance notice from the party opposite of this question and it has to do with the impact of a bill that is under the jurisdiction and the portfolio of the Minister of Health, and I'll refer the question to her, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Runciman:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: That's a complete falsehood. I gave this minister no notice—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Before we deal with the question, we must deal with the unparliamentary language. I know that the honourable member would like his question replied to, but the honourable member used some unparliamentary language and I would ask him to withdraw that.

1450

**Mr Runciman:** Mr Speaker, I will withdraw at your request, but on a further point of order I'll ask you a question as the Speaker of the House: I asked a very specific question in terms of the impact of legislation and job loss and how that minister and her ministry respond to the implications of legislation brought in by her colleagues in respect to that one area where she and her ministry are totally responsible.

Speaker, I would ask you for your advice and support. I cannot see where that question has any relationship in terms of a referral, and her request to refer should not be supported by the Chair.

**The Speaker:** I understand the member's point quite well and I appreciate the concern he expresses. Under the standing orders the minister has the right to refer. I attempted to assist the member by suggesting that she might wish to answer the question. The minister has the right to refer, she has in fact referred the question and has referred it to the Minister of Health. The minister may respond. The Minister of Health.

**Mr Runciman:** I have not asked anything about the Ministry of Health, Mr Speaker, and I do not see any grounds for you to support this—

**The Speaker:** I explained earlier to the member that under the standing orders a minister of the crown has the right to refer a question, and that is in fact what the member has done. The Minister of Health may answer the question if she wishes.

**Hon Ruth Grier (Minister of Health):** First of all, let me disabuse the member of any impression he may be under that any minister in this government unilaterally introduces legislation. They are collective decisions of our cabinet—

**Mr Runciman:** This is garbage, Mr Speaker, and you should not be supporting it.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** You are not doing your job, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** —and, as such, all aspects are taken into account.

**Mr Turnbull:** This is not what you are supposed to be doing.

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for York Mills come to order. The member for York Mills is out of order.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The Minister of Health.

**Hon Mrs Grier:** Mr Speaker, I answered the question. I don't hear a supplementary.

**The Speaker:** Is there a supplementary? New question.

#### ASSISTED HOUSING

**Ms Margaret H. Harrington (Niagara Falls):** My question is to the Minister of Housing. You know of the Clayton study which was commissioned by FRPO, that is, the Fair Rental Policy Organization of Ontario. This study claimed that shelter allowances are less expensive

than building non-profit housing. This has been an issue in my riding of Niagara Falls, where several landlords I know quite well, such as Felix Pingue and Mr Klein from Klein Construction, have raised this issue very sincerely. They feel that shelter allowances would certainly help them personally as well as cost the government less.

Your ministry has now had a chance to study the results of the Clayton Research Associates document. Minister, do you concur with its findings?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** Yes, I do, indeed I do, to the member. The original report done by Clayton for FRPO had suggested that the cost of doing non-profit housing for 1,100 of the neediest people who would be looking for housing over 50 years would be \$2.2 billion more than providing a shelter allowance. The analysis that we've done, which uses the same figures as the Clayton report but uses much more reasonable assumptions than the Clayton report, indicates that in fact the shelter allowance program would actually cost about \$6 million more over the same period.

**Ms Harrington:** I just want to get it very clear, once and for all, on the record: Non-profit housing versus shelter allowances, what is the truth? Which one is cheaper?

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** Our analysis is based on the fact, and it's quite clear to everyone, that the rising cost of rental housing and the associated cost of a rental subsidy program over a long period of time means that those costs are going up. With the non-profit housing program over a long period of time the highest costs are at the front end, and over time the costs go down, so there's a crossover point.

If you're taking it out 50 years, as the Clayton report did and the Clayton analysis did, then it's clear to us that over a long period of time, from a financial point of view, to say nothing of the fact that it's generating jobs and creating a new stock of affordable housing in the community, it's better to be doing non-profit housing.

#### REFERRAL OF QUESTION

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: On the issue of the question from my colleague from Leeds-Grenville to the minister and with regard to your interpretation of standing order 33(f), I would ask you to look into the subject matter to which the question relates and the matter of ministers referring.

This is not the first time that we've had to deal with this in the last couple of weeks, and I think this would be a good example of the prerogative of ministers to refer with regard to the standing order, and I will put it on the record:

"33(f) A minister to whom an oral question is directed may refer the question to another minister who is responsible for the subject-matter to which the question relates."

I would ask you to look into that.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy and Minister Responsible for Native Affairs):** On the same point of order, Mr Speaker: As a minister of the crown and a member of the executive council, I would like it clarified, Mr Speaker: Is it not the case that

it is within the rules for a member of the cabinet in answer to a question during the question-answer period to either answer or not answer as he or she sees fit?

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** On the same point of order, the member for Leeds-Grenville.

**Mr Jim Wiseman (Durham West):** Oh, I thought you were not coming back.

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** The tantrum's over.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Runciman:** Mr Speaker, I left because I didn't want to listen to the minister who had no responsibility.

My colleague from London North raises a good point in respect to the fact that this matter was referred to a minister who had no business responding to this. There was a very specific question related to the economic development minister's responsibilities and her ministry's responsibilities and how she has responded to a specific piece of legislation and its job implications.

That was very specific and related solely to her responsibilities and her ministry's responsibilities, and I want to support my colleague from London North because I think this has very grave implications for this assembly and for the functioning of the House and how the opposition can deal with matters of significant importance to them if we have this kind of fobbing off of responsibility and our inability to even get a response of any kind, way, shape or form from the minister responsible.

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** If I could just add to the point made by my colleague from London North, I have spoken with the member for Lanark-Renfrew, who in fact has discussed this matter, as has the member for Leeds-Grenville, with the Premier.

The Premier in talking to them indicated that he would take up the matter with the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, to whom the question was directed. The Premier obviously thought that the subject matter was subject matter that she should be dealing with. The Premier indicated as much to my two colleagues. That is why the question was directed to the cabinet minister that it was.

I understand that Bill 119 has carriage of the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health, I should say, has carriage of that particular piece of legislation. But this aspect of Bill 119, the subject matter of this section or sections of Bill 119, has very much to do with trade, has very much to do with employment and economic activity in these two members' ridings.

Obviously, they think so. Obviously, the Premier thinks so, and I think it only would've been fair if the minister who the Premier thought should be dealing with this matter answered the question.

**Hon Frances Lankin (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** I don't know if it will help the situation, but I certainly did not intend to cause a drama of this nature with respect to this. I can indicate that it



was my clear understanding, based on a conversation with the member for Lanark-Renfrew, that the question would be coming forth from the member for Lanark-Renfrew and the member for Leeds-Grenville today, that it would be with respect to this bill and with respect to the proposal of referring that one section of the bill out for public consultation and that it would also be tied into the job impact.

I understood that was part of the question. If I misunderstood that, then my apology, but I thought it was inappropriate for me to be responding on that point. I do believe that the member is correct that, with respect to any issues around jobs, economic development, that is appropriately within my portfolio. I think there was a miscommunication which led to my response. I apologize for that, and I'd be pleased to meet with the members and to respond to them and their concerns and their communities' concerns with respect to these issues.

1500

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** Mr Speaker, on that same point of order, and I do believe it's very important to this House—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for Brampton South has the floor.

**Mr Callahan:** I think it's very important to this House, because there have been two indications made, one by the member for London North to the effect that a minister may refer a question to a minister who is involved in the question. The Minister of Natural Resources quite rightly said that the rules allow a minister to refuse to answer.

I ask you, Mr Speaker, as well as the other members, to look at this, because the implications of it could be just as ludicrous as this: that a question could be asked of a minister on a specific trade or job issue, and that minister, instead of refusing to answer it, could refer it to the Solicitor General. That way you would block the possibilities of ever getting an answer from a minister who was responsible, thereby making question period a total farce.

**The Speaker:** First, to those members who have discussed this particular point of order and concern which has been brought to my attention, I appreciate it.

To the member for Leeds-Grenville, I understand the concern which he expressed with respect to his question that he was attempting to place and to the minister who he felt was the appropriate minister to whom to address the question.

I will be pleased to review the matter and I will report back to the House as soon as possible.

**Mrs Cunningham:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It is my understanding that in fact the minister is willing to answer the question, and therefore I don't think it's necessary that you rule on it. Why can't we have the question now?

**The Speaker:** First, I understand and I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Economic Development and Trade rose in her place and she offered an apology for everything that had unfolded. At the same time, a point

of order was raised. It is my responsibility to take a look at it. I'm more than pleased to do that.

Question period has expired. The only way in which you can now entertain a question is if we had unanimous consent for a question to be placed and responded to. Is there unanimous consent for a question to be placed to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** I heard at least one negative voice.

## PETITIONS

### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Hugh O'Neil (Quinte):** I have a petition which I'd like to present that has been submitted to me by residents of the riding of Quinte, and it concerns Bill 45 and Bill 56.

### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas several patients from the town of New Tecumseth are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments in Orillia or Toronto;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in New Tecumseth and one patient is forced to pay for her own nurse;

"Whereas the government continues to insist they are studying the problem, even though they have known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in New Tecumseth and Collingwood;

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of New Tecumseth."

I have signed this petition. I obviously agree with it, and in fact the contents of this petition are now the subject of public hearings which commence in a half-hour before the social development committee.

### EDUCATION FINANCING

**Mr Gary Malkowski (York East):** I have a petition here from York East. It's signed by 104 people and it says:

"Whereas the British North America Act of 1867 supports the rights of Catholic students to a Catholic education, and the province of Ontario supports two educational systems from kindergarten to grade 12/OAC;

"Whereas the Metropolitan Separate School Board educates more than 103,000 students across Metropolitan Toronto, and whereas this is equivalent to 30% of all the students in the area;

"Whereas the Metropolitan Separate School Board is expected to provide the same programs and services at its public school counterpart and must do so by receiving \$1,822 less for each elementary student and \$2,542 less

per secondary student (based on 1993 estimates and published statistics);

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act now to ensure that Ontario's two principal education systems are funded fully and equally."

#### MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

**Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall):** I have a petition that reads:

"Periodic health exams save money and lives. Prevention and screening costs less than treatment and cures. Prevention and screening may save your life or the life of your loved one.

"We, the undersigned, believe that all Ontarians should be covered for preventive health and periodic screening procedures. Money will not be saved by delisting preventive health exams."

I have signed that petition also, and it's signed by 80 of the residents of eastern Ontario.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** I have a petition to the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the costs of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;

"We, therefore, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario with the following:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course examination."

This comes from the Spencerville, Kemptville, Lancaster, Bainsville area, signed by other 40 constituents, and I have signed the petition as well.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I'm sure it comes as no surprise to you, Mr Speaker, that I have a petition from the folks of Twin Elms and Strathroy in my riding. They petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly to proceed as expeditiously as possible with third

reading of Bill 21."

I have signed my name to this petition.

#### VIOLENCE

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I have a petition signed by 94 people from the towns of Zurich, Clinton, Parkhill, Mitchell, Leith and Kirkwood, and I'd like to read it to the assembly.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;

"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to admire or emulate, but rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

I have signed this petition and I thank the members of the Catholic Women's League of Canada for submitting it.

1510

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters' advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own,

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I've signed this petition. It's also signed by a number of people from Stayner, Wasaga Beach, Creemore, Singhampton, Collingwood, New Lowell and many other places across the province and my riding.

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** I have a petition



similar to the one that was just read in. It was sent to me by R.G. Morgan, the executive vice-president of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. There are approximately 500 names on the petition. Most of those folks are residents of the riding of Oxford and about half of them are members of the federation; half of them are just citizens who signed the petition. So I would now be pleased to submit that petition.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Paul Wessinger (Simcoe Centre):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario with respect to Bill 45:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Ontario Legislature to stop this bill and to consider its impact on families in Ontario."

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** I have a petition similar to the one presented by my colleague the member for Oxford, and it was sent to me by the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. I've noted that a number of the people who have signed this petition are not members of that organization and some are. It petitions the Legislature, the Premier and the Solicitor General to change the plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination. I present that petition.

#### MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

**Mr Peter North (Elgin):** I have a petition here:

"We, the undersigned, believe that all Ontarians should be covered for preventive health and periodic screening procedures. Money will not be saved by delisting preventive health exams. Periodic health exams save money and lives. Prevention and screening costs less than treatment and cures. Prevention and screening may save your life or the life of a loved one. The government wants to delist this important service. Please say no."

It's signed by a number of people from the Elgin county area.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Peter North (Elgin):** I have a petition here to Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time to pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;

"I/we, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun

purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I have affixed my name to that.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### CITY OF BRAMPTON ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr McClelland, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr107, An Act respecting the City of Brampton.

##### CORONERS AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

##### LOI DE 1994 MODIFIANT

##### LA LOI SUR LES CORONERS

On motion by Mr Jackson, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 148, An Act to amend the Coroners Act / Projet de loi 148, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les coroners.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Do you have a brief statement to make?

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** The Coroners Amendment Act is based on recommendation 128 of the Jonathan Yeo inquest, which read:

"The chief coroner and coroners of Ontario are 'the voice of the dead for the benefit of the living,' therefore, for that voice to be heard for the benefits of the living, the power of the chief coroner of Ontario under the provisions of the Coroners Act to counsel this government for the implementation of jury recommendations must be increased.

"The Coroners Act shall be amended to provide that agencies, ministries and officials or persons to whom these recommendations are directed must respond to the chief coroner of Ontario in a timely fashion," and that the chief coroner report to the Ontario Legislature on an annual basis.

This bill responds to the concerns for an automatic coroner's inquest to be conducted whenever a person dies violently at the hands of a violent criminal put forward by Jim and Anna Stephenson. Their son, Christopher, was sexually assaulted and killed by Joseph Fredericks, a psychopathic paedophile released on mandatory supervision by the National Parole Board.

The bill also addresses the concerns of Priscilla de Villiers of Canadians Against Violence Everywhere Advocating its Termination, or CAVEAT, that automatic standing at an inquest be provided to the victims' families, and that is contained in recommendation 128 of the Yeo inquest.

This bill is about fairness and further protection for the rights of crime victims and their families to better fulfil the coroner's mandate: "From the death of one, we may learn to help lengthen the lives of many."

**The Deputy Speaker:** I would ask the members, in the future when a bill is introduced, to try to limit your comments as short as possible.

1520

##### TOWN OF NAPANEE ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Paul Johnson, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr70, An Act respecting the Town of Napanee.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY****LIQUOR CONTROL AMENDMENT ACT, 1993****LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT  
LA LOI SUR LES ALCOOLS**

Ms Churley moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 113, An Act to amend the Liquor Control Act /  
Projet de loi 113, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les alcools.

**Hon Marilyn Churley (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce Bill 113 for second reading. This legislation is necessary to fulfil our international trade obligations by making sure foreign-brewed beer has equal access to Ontario retail markets.

On August 5, 1993, Canada and the US signed a fair commercial agreement which benefited our domestic brewing industry, its labour force and Ontario consumers. As a result, imported beer became available at Brewers Retail beer stores across the province.

By amending the Liquor Control Act, the government will have the authority to guarantee equal treatment of imported and domestic products at Brewers Retail outlets.

A number of changes to the beer retail and distribution system have already taken place with the voluntary cooperation of the Brewers Retail. Nevertheless, part of our commitment to our trading partners was an assurance that we would implement the necessary legislative changes in order for the government to guarantee the continuation of these changes in the future.

These legislative changes will ensure a level playing field for all foreign, out-of-province and domestic brewers. At the same time, Bill 113 will ensure that our high regulatory standards governing the sale of beer in Ontario are maintained. I firmly believe that the Ontario brewing industry can be competitive in an open domestic market and highly successful in the international marketplace as well, as indeed it is proving now.

Finally, I am proud to say that Ontario fulfilled our international trade obligations without in any way compromising our legitimate environmental and social policy objectives. The environmental levy on all non-refillable beverage alcohol containers has been maintained. This policy is part of the overall environmental agenda of our government to promote a conserver society. The environmental levy provides an incentive to continue to use more environmentally sound containers. A reusable, refillable container backed by a deposit-and-return system that works is more environmentally sound than single-use containers.

In addition, we secured a recognition from GATT of minimum pricing as a legitimate social policy tool. Revenue from beverage alcohol taxation helps pay for Ontario's comprehensive health and social services network, a network that is lauded around the world. Minimum pricing protects our ability to preserve and enhance our social programs and social policy goals.

Most importantly, the changes we introduce will provide some essential stability to our brewing industry. They will enable our brewers and brewery workers to make plans to support competitive, viable operations in

Ontario and maintain thousands of brewery industry jobs.

I'd like to thank all of our partners in the industry and the unions who worked tirelessly with us throughout the couple of years. They helped us very much and I don't think we could have come through our negotiations so successfully. At times the negotiations were very difficult and tough and it was our partners who hung in there with us, gave us good advice, and I'd like to thank them for their support.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Are there any questions or comments?

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I think the minister will find general support for the principle of this bill. I do have one area of concern which has been referred to in the past, and that is that the bill seems to be silent on the removal of the 10-cent tax on beer cans in Ontario.

In the United States, as I understand it, the putting of beer in cans is the main choice; that's the main use in the United States. I guess I question the philosophy of that when I look at the fact that this tax doesn't exist to the soft drink industry; it only applies to the beer industry, which suggests that the province of Ontario is creating an unfair competition of tax with respect to the American jurisdiction, which may be contrary to the spirit of GATT. I don't know, but it is interesting that this legislation appears to be silent on that topic.

Aluminum beer cans and, as I understand it, refillable beer bottles are environmentally equivalent with respect to recycling. At 88%, Ontario has the highest recycling rate in the world with respect to cans.

I think the issue remains that the 10-cent tax on cans really isn't an effort for the purposes of them being environmentally sound. I would submit that in fact it's a tax to create competition for the Americans where the predominant use of manufacturing of beer is with respect to cans. Hopefully the minister will be in a position to comment on that before she leaves.

**The Deputy Speaker:** You have two minutes to reply, Minister.

**Hon Ms Churley:** I was about to leave, but I can't resist running back and taking him up on his offer on that. I think the member is aware that the situation is very different with the returnable system with beer bottles and pop cans.

The reality is that I believe it's over 60 years that the brewery industry has had a returnable deposit system for beer bottles. We've seen in BC, with the dumping of American cans coming into BC, their deposit return system really suffered. The reality is, we don't want to be in a position with a lot of American beer coming in here in cans, and in fact losing ground on a system that fortunately, unlike a lot of other jurisdictions, we have in place.

The reality with pop cans: We know it's been around for a long time. I know the Ministry of the Environment—through, I think by now, all three parties in this House—and the government side have tried to deal with it. It's a very different and much more complex situation.

I think we should be very pleased that we have the beer industry having such a sound system in place. We



wanted to make sure, within this bill, within these new negotiations, which were very hard fought—it was very difficult to get the federal government, the then Tory government, to go along with us on this, because they said what you said, but they were wrong. We have to preserve a system that works for us, and I'd like to see other companies and other products develop the same kind of system with the help of our government, but it is a very different situation. So I hope very much that you will support that aspect of the bill, because it is really important.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further debate?

**Mr Carman McClelland (Brampton North):** I want to initially say that the general provisions of the bill are appreciated, and the efforts of a number of interest groups that have sought to bring this to the floor of the Legislature today and to get on with it, so to speak, in terms of bringing things into compliance with GATT and the expectations related thereto are appreciated by all of the players.

Although it is somewhat tangential and parenthetical, I want to also express a hope, I suppose, and support for our wine industry in this province of Ontario that they would have the opportunity to aggressively market through their boutiques and through their onsite stores a product that I think is gaining, and rightly so, recognition and a positive reputation for the fine quality of product that is produced in this province. We're pleased to see that happen as well.

There are a few concerns, and they are significant, I think, particularly in terms of the so-called "house-keeping" provisions of this bill with respect to the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario and the provisions of Bill 113 as it impacts particularly restaurateurs in the province. I want to put on the record some of those concerns.

It's my understanding that House leaders have agreed that this bill will be referred to committee so that interested parties, particularly those from the Ontario Restaurant Association and other interested parties, may have an opportunity not only to express their concerns but to hear back from the minister the rationale for the provisions within the bill that have been put forward.

Let me raise those issues very quickly because, as I said, I think they'll be given a more complete and full hearing at the committee level, when not only will there be an opportunity for dialogue and exchange with the minister or her designate but also ministry staff and political staff on that occasion will, I'm sure, resolve some of the concerns that are being expressed.

As we look at the legislation as it's written, one concern that jumps to mind immediately, by a number of individuals, is raised by way of section 4.1 of the bill. I'll read that on the record for reference. It says, "The chair of the board may designate any person as an inspector to carry out inspections," and it goes on to indicate the reasons inspections would take place.

1530

The language is at best vague in terms of how a person would be designated, "any person." I know it's not necessarily out of sync with other enabling legislation

that provides ministerial prerogative and authority to designate agents and/or officials on behalf of that minister and the operation that is ancillary to the rightful monitoring and—I use this word advisedly, I hope—policing of the responsibilities of people who operate under a legislative framework.

The nub of the issue is simply this: The language is somewhat vague in terms of "any person" being designated as an inspector. People in the industry would like to see some sort of provision attached to that or a reference to a regulatory framework so that there would be some handle in terms of how that person, he or she, would come to be appointed as an inspector, the qualifications that individual would bring to that position and their understanding of the industry.

If one is to engage in the very significant responsibility of an inspector, one would hope, and I think it's a reasonable expectation, that they would be qualified. That almost goes without saying. But I can understand the concern of restaurateurs who see that and ask, "Is this the situation again where we're giving carte blanche to a government, without any recourse and without any handles for us to deal with those individuals who may be appointed as an inspector?"

I put that on the record simply as an introduction of a point that I suspect our friends in the Ontario Restaurant Association will subsequently put some more meat on the bones of, if you will, flesh it out somewhat so they can more fully articulate that concern and, as I said earlier, the opportunity to dialogue with the minister and/or her representatives to address that concern.

Let me jump down to the two subsequent sections, sections 4.2 and 4.3, that have raised some concerns as well. Section 4.2 starts out by saying, "An inspector may enter any premises described in subsection (2)"—and it goes on to describe the premises—"for the purposes of ensuring compliance with" a variety of acts and regulations.

Section 4.3 indicates, "A justice of the peace may issue a warrant authorizing an inspector...to exercise any of the powers." What we have here, chronologically within the body of the act, is a bill that says an inspector has, by way of right, the authority to enter a premises, and I'll indicate the sensitive point of the definition of "premises" in a moment. Section 4.3 then goes on to say, "A justice of the peace may issue a warrant" to allow those powers to be exercised.

It seems, on the face of it, contradictory that in one section you would give the authority that would reside within the office of an inspector, that he or she could exercise that authority, and yet in section 4.3 you go on to say that for essentially the same fulfilment of an individual's responsibilities as an inspector, they would have an opportunity and provide a mechanism by which they would go before a justice of the peace to obtain a warrant.

You can understand the confusion that I think legitimately exists with restaurateurs in wanting to understand the rationale for that. Why, on one hand, do you give the inspector the opportunity to walk in, and then the very next section of the bill says we will give

the inspector a procedure whereby she or he will go to a justice of the peace to obtain a warrant to enter a premises?

One would think if they're entering an establishment where liquor is being served pursuant to a licence, that would not necessarily be problematic, because we would presume and hope that virtually all people who are operating in the hospitality industry want to do so in compliance with the law. Indeed, those who are doing so would want their competitors to be playing on a level playing field and would hope that the inspectors would fulfil their rightful responsibility in ensuring that happened.

The difficulty for some lies in this. "Premises" goes on to define a locale where "books or records relating to the sale, service, manufacture or storage of liquor are kept or are required to be kept." If you think of some of the major restaurants that some of us have perhaps visited from time to time, generally speaking, they would have a system in place where professional staff do their bookkeeping and accounting. The fact of the matter is that there are literally hundreds, perhaps thousands—I think I'm safe to say thousands—of small operations, often family-run, often where three, four or five members of the family run that establishment. There are thousands of those kinds of establishments across the province.

What often happens is that they work 16-, 18- or 20-hour days in some cases, particularly on weekends. They throw all their receipts and their bookkeeping materials into a briefcase and take it home. In some spare moments, sometimes on a weekend or whenever they might have a slower day, they sit down and do their bookkeeping and their recordkeeping. Some people in this industry, I'm sure you're well aware, work extremely long and hard hours. It's only practical and quite a matter of convenience for them to be able to do their recordkeeping and keep their books and so forth at their place of residence.

You can understand, therefore, the concern, if you understand what I just said with respect to section 4.2 and the power of entry that would be afforded an inspector, without a warrant, to enter into a place where records and books are kept and that place happened to be a person's residence. You can understand that there would be some concerns.

I understand the delicacy of trying to balance an issue of doing effective monitoring and effective control over the industry. By the same token, I think there's an issue with respect to the power of the state as it effects itself upon our lives and indeed our residences. I recognize that people make a reasoned business decision to use their homes for the purpose of conducting their business, but it seems to most people that the last place of refuge is your home.

I have some very grave concerns about the right of an officer, an inspector, under legislation, whoever she or he may be, I'm sure exercising their job in good faith, in good conscience, to just enter into a home. I know the minister—I regret that she's not here—would perhaps want to make some comments with respect to that particular issue. I understand why it's there, but I think

we have to really get our heads around that particular issue and come to some reasonable balance and control with respect to the right of entry into a person's premises.

I feel very strongly with respect to the issue of private property and a person's residence. Notwithstanding the fact that an individual may make a conscious and reasoned decision to use their residence for business, I think they should be afforded some measure of protection in terms of the government arriving at that particular locale and entering upon it and seizing documents and records and so forth.

Having said that, I again hope, as it comes before committee for the opportunity of further discussion, that that particular issue would be further articulated and the competing interests discussed, with a reasonable and workable balance and solution that everybody can live with.

The last point I want to raise is similar. It deals with a specific provision of this bill that is contained in section 4.4. As I read it—and again I regret that we don't have the opportunity for feedback from the minister at this point—section 4.4 sets out a mechanism whereby an inspector, having found something that appears to be inappropriate or not, on the face of it, in compliance with regulations, may seize property of the operator of an establishment.

It then goes on to say that this inspector should promptly and with reasonable dispatch return those items into the possession of the owner and operator. Again, on behalf of the many thousands of women and men who are engaged in the hospitality industry, they are asking that the government consider something more definitive, whereby there's a specified time frame, where there's an onus upon the inspectors to return it within a specified period of time, 48 hours or 72 hours, whatever the case may be, and if they aren't able to do that, provide a reason and/or rationale for it.

1540

My suspicion is that in the vast majority of cases it would be fairly routine that documents would be seized—I know that sounds a little bit onerous and heavy-handed, but I think in the context people understand that—by an inspector and that inspector would probably go to an office nearby, a government office presumably, photocopy the documentation, appropriately catalogue the material and return it to the restaurateur.

I might add that there is a provision in the act that says that prior to taking it a receipt must be given for each and every item seized. I think that's indicative of the goodwill contained in here with respect to the powers of the inspector.

But to try and summarize that point, restaurateurs would say that perhaps the onus should fall back upon ministry officials to maintain in their possession any records or any property beyond a specified period of time, so there would be a fail-safe mechanism built in there for the prompt return of those materials, another level of assurance and/or confidence that might be given to restaurateurs with respect to records and goods that were seized.



I think and I hope that on behalf of those individuals in the industry I have at least put on the record the substance of their concerns, perhaps not as well as they will doubtless do when they have the opportunity to come before committee.

I want to acknowledge and thank the government and my colleague the House leader and critic for the third party for working together to make sure the restaurant association has an opportunity to put its concerns in a very direct way to the minister and to her officials.

In summary, let me say this. There are a few house-keeping concerns, those I tried to articulate, that I think raise the need for some further discussion and the opportunity to dialogue and come to a resolution that everybody can live with. I want to indicate, on behalf of the official opposition, that we support the general thrust of the bill. We look forward to getting on with it and putting things in compliance with our international responsibilities, and in that context look forward to a continued and, hopefully, successful growth of both our domestic producers, their related industry, and those in the hospitality industry to continue to be able to provide the generally good and excellent service they provide for us in this province.

Thank you for the opportunity of putting those concerns on the record, and I look forward to the continued discussion here this afternoon.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Are there any questions or comments?

**Mr Noel Duignan (Halton North):** I'm pleased to rise to speak for a couple of minutes in relation to this issue. I note with concern some of the issues raised by the member for Brampton North and indeed look forward to the public hearings to air those concerns further.

Our legal experts in the ministry have informed me that provisions under section 4.2 of the LCA do not constitute an exception but are rather the norm, and provisions of the kind found under section 4.2 of the LCA also exists under the following: the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, the Travel Industry Act, the gaming control act and the Liquor Licensing Act. I am further informed that a warrant is usually not sought until after there is sufficient reason to believe that the subject of the inspection is suspect. But again I'm pleased to listen to the concerns raised by the member for Brampton North in that area.

Under the question of hours, he's well aware that under that particular section of the act, the hours are set out. The subsection establishes the hours in which a warrant may in fact be executed. Clause 4.3(4)(a) is for business premises and 4.3(4)(b) is for other premises. In 4.3(4)(a), it's "during the normal business hours of the place named in the warrant, in the case of a place of business" and (b) "in any other case, between the hours of 6 am and 9 pm." Also, the justice of the peace has discretion to set other hours as necessary.

Again, I'm pleased to listen to the comments of the member for Brampton North. I look forward to hearing other concerns raised by the industry when the committee meets for the one day.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further questions or comments? You have two minutes, if you want to reply.

**Mr McClelland:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I don't think I need two minutes simply to say to the member for Halton North, who is, as we all know, the parliamentary assistant for the ministry, that in terms of my comments, having said initially that I recognize it is consistent with other legislation—perhaps you didn't hear that—therein lies a bit of the problem. The restaurateurs are saying, "Maybe this government isn't hearing us, to be able to sit down and dialogue."

The parliamentary assistant rose and said he wanted to assure me of something I'd already said I was aware of. The restaurateurs are saying, "Are you really hearing us?" and therein lies their concern. They want to sit down and talk to you because, as the parliamentary assistant has said, there is some rationale for it but they haven't had the opportunity to discuss it, they feel. Indeed, I say this, and I hope it's taken in the context I'm going to put it in—I'm not trying to be confrontational: The minister indicated to me today that she wasn't even aware that the restaurateurs had concerns.

I think it's reasonable that the parliamentary assistant has said that they look forward to the opportunity to discuss it in more detail, and again I thank them for that, because I think therein lies the root of the problem, the genesis of the problem: that the restaurateurs have not had, in their opinion, the opportunity to discuss with the ministry and with ministry officials that exchange.

I thank the parliamentary assistant for responding and the goodwill he expresses and look forward to the opportunity to discuss this with the interested parties. I'm sure we'll come to a resolution that everybody can live with; that we can get on with the act and deal with essentially the foundation of the act, the international compliance issues, which are really the substance and the rationale for this act being brought forward, and deal with the ancillary issues in a fashion that keeps everybody happy. I think that's important and we all want to do that.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further debate?

**Mr Ernie L. Eves (Parry Sound):** I'd like to comment on a few aspects of Bill 113 briefly this afternoon.

Supposedly the purpose for Bill 113 is to comply with the GATT agreement, yet it's interesting to note that a great majority of Bill 113 does nothing with respect to GATT. The GATT provisions are generally taken care of by regulatory powers which are not outlined and stipulated in the bill. As a matter of fact, it is of course an amendment to the Liquor Control Act of Ontario.

It's also interesting to note that the bill was first introduced for first reading on December 7, 1992. We are now in April 1994. About a year and a half later, we're finally getting around to dealing with second reading of this piece of legislation.

I, like my colleague from Brampton North, would like to encourage the provisions of the bill that deal with wine, beer and spirits being sold in their own stores. This is going to be very important to the wine and spirit industry in the province of Ontario, and I think it's about time.

I'd like to deal with an aspect that is not touched upon with respect to this particular piece of legislation, and not touched upon in the act, and that is the matter of interprovincial trade. What happens to other provinces in Canada under the treatment the Ontario government is giving them is that breweries, for example, in New Brunswick, Moose Head being an example, are going to be treated the same as American breweries. I don't agree with that. I think that being a Canadian should mean something.

Recently we've seen in the media that over the last few weeks there's been a discussion among trade ministers from all provinces with respect to interprovincial free trade. I understand the position that the Premier has taken and that the Minister of Economic Development and Trade has taken. Quite frankly, I concur with a lot of the things they have said with respect to the overall agreement they were trying to reach. But surely we should be treating fellow or sister provinces a little bit differently than we treat foreign jurisdictions with respect to their product.

But as I understand it—and the minister or the parliamentary assistant will surely correct me if I'm wrong—the three distribution charges that are charged against foreign beers, for example, are also applied to beers brewed in other provinces in Canada. I think that's wrong, and I think it's about time we changed that and how we deal with fellow or sister Canadians in our own country.

Another aspect I want to touch on very briefly is the one that was mentioned in a two-minute Q&A by my colleague the member for Dufferin-Peel, that is, that this legislation does nothing about dealing with the 10-cent-a-can levy charged on cans. The ministry and the government can talk around this issue all they want. They say this is an environmental issue. The reality is that it is a 10-cent-a-can tax directed towards the American brewery system.

1550

The minister and the ministry well acknowledge, I'm sure, that unlike Canadian brewery products, most American products are sold in cans as opposed to bottles. They refer to the 10-cent-a-can levy as an environmental tax. If they were serious about the environment, it would apply to all cans, not just beer cans. Why are beer cans the only ones being centred out? I think we know the answer to that. This is in fact a hidden 10-cent tariff on American beer coming into Ontario. Why don't we just admit that's what it is instead of calling it an environmental tax?

If it were an environmental tax and they were concerned about the environment, there are a lot more soft drink cans out there floating around the province than there are beer cans, and if they're interested in cleaning up the environment, there'd be a 10-cent levy on every can, I don't care what's in it, in the province of Ontario.

That is a red herring of an argument. They know it. I know it. Admit it. It's a 10-cent trade barrier tariff on American beer. That's what it is. Just admit it. Be up front. But you can't do that because you're afraid, of course, that the Americans, and quite rightly so, are going

to get a little uptight because you won't be complying with GATT. But you call it an environmental tax.

The Minister of Environment shakes his head. Perhaps it's a good point for him to engage in a debate, in a two-minute Q&A. Why is this 10-cent-a-can levy not applicable to all cans in the province? I think we need to have that answered. If our real concern is the environment and we're concerned about this, then it would be applicable to every single can, including soft drink cans. I wait to hear his two-minute Q&A on that.

With respect to the bill, I would also like to reiterate or state a couple of concerns that have been raised by my colleague from Brampton North and that have also been raised today by the Ontario Restaurant Association, which has been in touch with us and I presume the minister as well. We have talked to the government House leader. He has agreed to send this bill to the justice committee briefly so that at least the Ontario Restaurant Association and its concerns can be heard in committee by way of public hearings.

Having just spoken to the Ontario Restaurant Association a few moments ago, again, it is concerned that most of the GATT regulation or subject matter is being dealt with by regulation as opposed to being dealt with in the statute. They feel that there hasn't been an opportunity for enough public input with respect to that aspect of the bill. Presumably they will be satisfied by being able to go to the justice committee and having those concerns looked at.

They are also somewhat concerned that the Canadian-American beer agreement may be on some shaky ground. They understand that the Americans are seriously considering charging an additional levy against Canadian beer because they feel Ontario's not living up to its side of the agreement. Presumably, we will hear more about that during the public hearing aspect or period of this bill as well.

Their third concern is about the pricing of alcohol in the province of Ontario, particularly as it relates to border communities because they're concerned about the lack of competitiveness. For example, they say a large Ontario brewery sells its product for less in Detroit than it does in the province of Ontario, in Windsor for example. That causes them some concern. They believe that's bad for the hospitality industry and they believe it's bad for the tourism industry, particularly in border communities in the province of Ontario.

As alluded to by other colleagues of mine before, they are concerned about the expansion of powers given under sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 of the bill. I heard what the parliamentary assistant said. They have concerns about the presumption of guilt as opposed to innocence. They have concerns about the power to enter into homes or private dwellings, which could be, I suppose, if you read section 4.2 carefully—"An inspector" without a warrant "may enter any premises...at which books or records relating to the sale, service, manufacture or storage of liquor are kept or are required to be kept."

That would mean that if the owner of a licensed premises chose to keep some of his or her books at home, an inspector without a warrant would have the power to



enter into a private residence or dwelling at which such records were being kept. They are concerned about that and they would at least like the opportunity to address that in committee and hear what the government has to say about it.

They are a little concerned about, as I said, the definition of those premises under section 4.2. They're also concerned about the return of seized items and documents. There doesn't seem to be anything in the legislation, as the member for Brampton North has already alluded, as to when those items and those documents have to be returned to them. There's no time stipulation.

As he has said, we are in favour of the general principle of the legislation, but the Ontario Restaurant Association and others have these concerns that they would like addressed. I think that perhaps now that the bill is going to committee briefly, we'll be able to do that there.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any questions or comments?

**Mr Duignan:** I appreciate the comments of the honourable member and indeed I look forward too to the public hearings to clear some of the air on some of the issues raised by the honourable member.

I want to assure the honourable member that Ontario is not more closed to other Canadian beer than any other province in Canada. We are not any less fair than any other province. In fact, we were one of the first provinces to let beer into its market, and I believe that is cooperation.

On the whole question of issuing a warrant, "A justice of the peace" is authorized to "issue a warrant authorizing an inspector...to enter premises" in order "to search for and seize" evidence, but they would require a search warrant to do that.

Again, I look forward to the public hearings as well to clear the air on some of these issues and listen to the concerns of the restaurant association.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further questions or comments? The member for Parry Sound, you have two minutes.

**Mr Eves:** I was just looking forward to the comments about the environmental tax on cans from the Minister of Environment, but I guess he's not going to comment on it.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any further debate?

**Mr Tilson:** The member for Halton North spoke with respect to the issue of a warrant. I can tell you that on your interpretation of section 4.2 as to whether you need a warrant, with respect to section 4.2 you don't need a warrant. You can simply go in. The inspector can go into any premises without a warrant and do any number of things as are specified, and that's the problem we're raising on this side of the House.

You're right that the next section refers to the requirement of a warrant, and that is only obtained when the inspector may be refused entry or the inspector may have reasonable grounds to believe that the inspector will be denied entry, and that's the problem. I guess the very generality and vagueness that the member for Parry Sound has raised with respect to section 4.2 is simply that

you need far more clarity with respect to that issue.

The bill seems to do a number of things and I think that members on this side, as we've indicated, support in general principle the philosophy of the bill. It does amend the Liquor Control Act in order to implement the province of Ontario's obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. I think we support that in general principle.

Bill 113 also "gives the Liquor Control Board power to impose conditions on authorizations granted by or on appointments made by the board under the act."

It's the third point that I wish to spend some time on this afternoon. The legislation "provides for inspections of premises at which liquor is sold, served, manufactured, kept or stored for the purpose of ensuring compliance with applicable legislation." As I indicated at the outset, it is that very concern, the very vagueness of section 4.2, that I have general concerns with.

1600

The fourth issue, of course, is that it allows manufacturers of Ontario wine and beer and spirits to sell their products in their own stores.

I guess it's interesting, just to show the concern of this government, that this bill was initially introduced on December 7, 1992. Obviously, this government hasn't been in very much of a hurry to pass this legislation to give US brewers access to its beer stores, and the delay may be justified by the timetable it's had in the past, but certainly it hasn't been of prime importance to wait all this time to bring it to second reading.

I'd like to spend some time on section 4.2, because I'd recommend that between now and when we come back to the House for third reading, either at the committee stage or before that, the government seriously consider amending this section.

Section 4.2 says, "An inspector may enter any premises described in subsection (2)...." Those are as follows: Those have to be where "liquor is sold, served, manufactured, kept or stored." Very general phrases. It could conceivably mean one's house. I'm sure that's not the intention, but where "liquor is...kept or stored." That's what subsection (2) says. Then it goes on: "for the purposes of ensuring compliance with this act, the Liquor Licence Act, the Wine Content Act or any other regulations under those acts."

It may well be the government is saying, "Oh, well, that ensures compliance," but I will say that the wording of this legislation simply says that without a warrant, in my reading of this section, an inspector can simply go to premises, and it's not against the law for them to enter those premises, any premises where liquor is "sold, served, manufactured, kept or stored." That's the only requirement and they can simply enter those premises. It's very general phraseology which I believe should be clarified.

The second reason for which an inspector may enter premises is, "at which books or records relating to the sale, service, manufacture or storage of liquor are kept or are required to be kept."

That may not be quite as damning as the first subsec-

tion, but certainly it leads me to believe that an inspector can enter premises, any premises, whether it be residential or commercial, without a warrant.

Why do I come to that conclusion? Because then I turn over to section 4.3 and 4.3 sets forth when you need a warrant, and the only time you need a warrant is when "the inspector has been denied entry," forcibly denied entry, or the inspector has "reasonable grounds to believe that" entry is going to be denied. So for any other reason, it's not illegal for an inspector to enter commercial premises or residential premises. That's the interpretation that I believe needs to be clarified in due course, hopefully, by the government.

Then it goes on to say what the inspector can do, and all of this is without a warrant. The inspector can "remove documents or things"—I have no idea what that means—"relevant to the inspection for the purpose of making copies or extracts." These are quite wide-ranging powers that an inspector has without a warrant. Removing "things relevant to the inspection that cannot be copied and may be evidence of the commission of an offence," and then there are a number of other sections, "conduct such tests as are reasonably necessary for the inspection."

That's the main purpose of my rising in this House today, the concern that I don't believe inspectors should be given that general ability to enter premises without a warrant, for no reason whatsoever. The only ground is where "liquor is sold, served, manufactured, kept or stored." That's all they need to know. It's not illegal for them to do that, I would think then, if that should be the case.

The final issue I'd like to speak on has to do with an issue that I spoke on in response to the minister, and that had to do with the fact that Bill 113, this particular bill that's before us today, does nothing to remove the 10-cent levy on cans in Ontario, which creates a problem with the American companies because for most American companies this is the emphasis of choice of packaging in the United States.

If the government felt as strongly as it did on environmental matters, why wouldn't it extend this 10-cent levy to soft drink cans? It's rather suspicious that it affects strictly beer cans. In other words, it's almost a form of discrimination against the American beer companies, which is what the overall intent of the legislation is trying to avoid, and that was to put everyone on the same playing field.

The 10-cent tax will add, has added, \$2.40 to a case of 24 cans of beer and it doesn't apply to refillable bottles. Again, I emphasize that generally speaking, beer is sold in cans in the United States. Aluminum beer cans and refillable beer bottles are environmentally equivalent, and as I've indicated, Ontario already has the highest recycling rate in the world.

That would be the second point I would hope the government would consider in possible amendments to this legislation, removing that 10-cent levy on cans in Ontario, because the principle as to why that tax was put forward in the first place simply doesn't apply.

Ontario, to my knowledge, unless someone can correct

me, is the only province with a special tax on beer cans, and because it doesn't go with respect to soft drink cans, that leads me to believe that the sole purpose of that 10-cent tax isn't for the environmental purpose that the Minister of Finance has said in the past or the Minister of Environment has said in the past, but it's simply to create discrimination for American beer companies.

About 40% of the beer sold in Ontario is in aluminum cans and there's no evidence, either at the time that 10-cent tax was issued or now, that the 10-cent levy would improve the Ontario environment.

Those are the brief concerns I have with respect to this legislation. I'm pleased that—at least I think it's been agreed—it's going to committee, because I think that some of the interest groups should add their comments and hopefully that committee will make recommendations of amendments, particularly with the civil rights issue that clearly jumps out at us when we read section 4.2.

It clearly jumps out at us that something is wrong when you allow an inspector to enter someone's premises without any reasonable and probable grounds to believe that an offence is being committed. They simply can go in there, as long as it's being sold, served, manufactured, kept or stored. Those are the sole grounds for the entry without a warrant to premises, and I don't think the people involved in this industry should be put to that discretion.

Mr Speaker, I'd like to thank you for participating in debate this afternoon.

1610

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Questions or comments? Further debate? Seeing none, does the honourable minister wish to wrap up? Parliamentary assistant.

**Mr Duignan:** I'll just take a couple of minutes and go over some of the points raised by the honourable members. Again, amendments to the Liquor Control Act will make it possible for the government to guarantee changes to the provincial beer retail and distribution system that have already taken place with the cooperation of Brewers Retail Inc. These changes are necessary to meet Ontario's international trade obligations and will ensure equal treatment for imported products, especially for imported beer.

Since September 1991, the GATT ruling on provincial beer policies, Ontario has responded quickly to comply with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. As far as we know, at this particular time our bill is consistent with GATT and, again as far as we know, the US negotiators have no serious concerns.

The amendments we have introduced reflect Ontario's ongoing commitment to meet our international trade obligations. Working in close consultation with our domestic industry and brewer workers, Ontario made a strong representation to the federal government for a response to GATT supported by both the beer industry and labour, and indeed it was our government insisting that we have a proper approach to GATT that ensured the viability of a strong beer industry in this province. Without our strong representation, the federal government



would have sold this particular industry down the tubes the same as it sold other industries down the tubes in relation to NAFTA.

The partnership we have created between brewers, government and brewery unions resulted in changes that would enable the Ontario brewing industry to compete successfully in both an open domestic market and the international sphere as well.

Let there be no mistake about it: Our domestic industry welcomes the opportunity to compete head to head with the United States. We have full confidence in our industry's ability to hold its own, thereby maintaining the jobs and livelihoods of thousands of people working in the industry.

As a first step to prepare for the removal of international barriers, in March 1992 we announced the elimination of interprovincial beer trade barriers, permitting out-of-province spirits to be sold in Brewers Retail stores.

In the summer of 1992, we eliminated listing policies, introduced a single pricing system for imported and domestic beer and made a commitment to provide access to imported beers at Brewers Retail stores, with the voluntary assistance of the Ontario brewers. We have been meeting that commitment.

As my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has already stated, the recent Canada-US beer deal maintained the high standards of our domestic brewing industry and beverage alcohol distribution system here in Ontario.

I would also like to focus on another aspect of this important agreement: It has maintained Ontario's access to one of the largest markets in the world, that of the United States. This important competitive opportunity for Ontario brewers is no small matter. Traditionally, around 15% of domestic beer production in Ontario has been produced for the United States market. American consumers have long recognized Canadian beer as a distinctive, high-quality product that is much in demand. Canadian beer sales in the United States have never been better.

Since the commercial agreement was signed last summer, Canadian beer exports to the United States, most of which originate from Ontario, increased dramatically, up some 47% in October 1993 and 29% in November 1993. Of course, this kind of economic success story translates into job opportunities at Ontario packaging plants and breweries and in the transport industry.

I would also like to speak very briefly to another aspect of Bill 113, and that is the proposed amendments to the Liquor Control Act which will give Ontario's eight distillers a chance to market their products in a new and viable manner. The new legislation will permit distillers to sell their products at retail stores located in the manufacturing sites in the province. As you may already know, wineries and brewers currently enjoy this privilege. I believe it's time that Ontario distillers were granted equal treatment. Wineries in the Niagara region have greatly benefited from onsite retail outlets. Numerous award-winning wineries are attracting an ever-increasing number of tourists eager to learn about the winemaker's art and

visit a beautiful part of our province.

In conclusion, I know Ontario distillers would welcome the opportunity to open an onsite retail store. The sooner this legislation is passed, the sooner it might benefit the local economies for distillers of established manufacturing sites.

I look forward to the public hearings on this to deal with some of the concerns raised by the members for Dufferin-Peel, for Parry Sound and for Brampton North and indeed by the restaurant association. I look forward to those hearings.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions or comments? Further debate?

Ms Churley has moved second reading of Bill 113, An Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I declare the motion carried.

**Mr Duignan:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We wish this Bill 113 to be referred to the justice committee. I understand there's agreement of all three parties that we'd have a day of hearings on this.

**The Acting Speaker:** Do we have agreement that the bill go to justice committee? Agreed? Agreed. The bill is so ordered.

Orders of the day. The honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**Hon Howard Hampton (Minister of Natural Resources):** Order number 6, Mr Speaker, and I believe that there is agreement to stack the votes on this order until the end of committee of the whole consideration of the entire matter.

**Interjections:** No.

**Mr Eves:** With respect to the stacking, Mr Speaker, I don't believe we discussed deferring it to the end of the bill. I believe we did discuss stacking to the end of the day.

**The Acting Speaker:** Do we have agreement to refer stacking to the end of this day? Agreed? Agreed.

*House in committee of the whole.*

TOBACCO CONTROL ACT, 1993

LOI DE 1993

SUR LA RÉGLEMENTATION  
DE L'USAGE DU TABAC

Consideration of Bill 119, An Act to prevent the Provision of Tobacco to Young Persons and to Regulate its Sale and Use by Others / Projet de loi 119, Loi visant à empêcher la fourniture de tabac aux jeunes et à en réglementer la vente et l'usage par les autres.

**The Second Deputy Chair (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Questions, comments or amendments, and if so, to which section?

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I'd request an opportunity to move to the front row of the Legislature and call in a couple of staff who may want to help, should I need a little bit of assistance in answering the questions or comments that might be put forward by my colleagues.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The honourable member can proceed with that request.

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I question the presence of a quorum in the House.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Could the clerk clarify if indeed we have a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Chair.

*The Second Deputy Chair ordered the bells rung.*

1620

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The honourable member for Durham-York may proceed. Amendments, comments and/or questions, and if there are amendments, to which sections, please. We'll deal with those first.

**Mr O'Connor:** At this point, the government doesn't have any amendments. We look forward to participating in this debate, as my colleagues seem to have some amendments that they would like to bring forward for discussion at this point.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Questions, comments or amendments by other members.

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** I have an amendment here which reads as follows—

**The Second Deputy Chair:** I would ask the honourable member to simply tell us which section it applies to and we will deal with it as we proceed.

**Mr McGuinty:** It applies to section 9 of the existing bill, and I'm asking that the bill be amended by adding the following paragraph—

**The Second Deputy Chair:** We'll deal with that. There may be amendments prior to that section.

**Mr Runciman:** Mr Chair, I move adjournment of the House.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The member for Leeds-Grenville has moved adjournment of the House.

I am advised that the honourable member can move that the committee rise and report but cannot move adjournment of the House.

The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville, comments, questions or amendments.

**Mr Runciman:** I have several amendments which have been distributed to the table and to the other two parties: an amendment to subsection 5(1), an amendment to clause 18(1)(d) and subsection 18(3).

**The Second Deputy Chair:** I thank the honourable member for Leeds-Grenville.

We will therefore proceed, committee of the whole, with Bill 119. We've been advised by the opposition that there will be amendments. It's An Act to prevent the Provision of Tobacco to Young Persons and to Regulate its Sale and Use by Others.

Sections 1 through 4 be carried without amendments. Agreed? Agreed.

We do have the first amendment, the honourable member for Leeds-Grenville, to subsection 5(1).

**Mr Runciman:** These amendments are being introduced by members of the Conservative Party, related to

generic packaging, most of them, certainly a significant majority.

*Interjections.*

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Please, the member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor.

**Mr Runciman:** These are related to the generic packaging provisions of the act. In this motion related to subsection 5(1), and I'll put it on the record—is that appropriate at this time, Mr Chair?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Yes.

**Mr Runciman:** I move that subsection 5(1) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Packaging to bear information

"(1) No person shall sell or offer to sell tobacco at retail or for subsequent sale at retail or distribute or offer to distribute it for that purpose unless the package bears or contains a health warning and other information in accordance with the regulations."

I appreciate this opportunity. Although the Conservative Party is essentially in support of Bill 119 and the bulk of provisions inherent in the bill, we're very much concerned about the generic packaging element. Our concerns are based on the impact it will have on jobs in the province of Ontario, and the fact that it would appear that the government and members of the social development committee who supported the legislation in its present form were not aware of the economic impact and the job losses that would flow from the initiatives they've undertaken in respect to the implementation of generic packaging in the province.

I want to put some of these facts on the record now in the hope that government members, and hopefully members of the Liberal Party as well, will sit back and take some time to appreciate the significance of what they're doing.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I've read through the standing orders. I know there was a motion to adjourn. I read page 36, section 42(h), and I see no place where the standing orders say that during committee of the whole a motion to adjourn is not in order. I ask that you, as Chair of committee of the whole House, guide me as to where this is written and where exactly I may find the motion within the standing orders that says a motion to adjourn is out of order.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** I'm advised that the honourable member can move adjournment of the debate, which would then mean—no, sorry. You cannot in committee move adjournment of the debate. It's simply a matter of moving that the committee rise and report, which would terminate committee of the whole.

**Mr Stockwell:** The point of order I asked, Mr Chair, is that I would therefore assume that that would be outlined in the standing orders, that a motion to adjourn and a motion to adjourn the debate is not in order. I'm looking on page 36, where we deal with consideration of the committee of the whole House, and nowhere in the standing orders do I find the item that says you can't adjourn. Now, it may well be you found it, but it certainly isn't dealt with on page 36 in the standing orders.



**The Second Deputy Chair:** The Legislature at present is sitting in committee and not in the regular proceedings of the Legislature. The mace is not on the table, and therefore we are sitting in committee, as in a regular committee room. Therefore, it is not in order for the committee to adjourn the House.

**Mr Stockwell:** Okay. But as I suggested, Mr Chair, there are motions to adjourn committees and there are motions to adjourn debates at committees, and those motions I guess would be applicable to a committee of the whole House. Mr Chair, if those are in order in a committee and we are in fact in a committee, why are they not in order here?

1630

**The Second Deputy Chair:** My understanding is that the only way this can be done is to move that the committee do rise and report. That is how you adjourn the committee of the whole when the mace is not on the table.

**Mr Stockwell:** I thank you for your patience, Mr Chair, and would ask again. In committees there are procedures to allow committees to adjourn and there are procedures to allow committees to adjourn debate. I wonder why those particular motions within committees are not applicable. The only difference I see is that rather than being in a small committee state, of some 12 or 15 members, we're in the large committee of the whole House state. Why do those committees' rulings not apply to a committee of the whole House?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** It is my understanding that it is simply because a committee cannot order the House to adjourn, because we are in committee of the whole.

**Mr Stockwell:** With all due respect, Mr Chair, a committee isn't asking the House to adjourn. We are in committee. How on the one hand can you argue that, being in committee, it is not allowed to have the rules of the House followed, but being in a committee you can't then follow the rules of the committee? One way or the other, there have to be rules involved in this place.

I ask you, under what rules are we operating, the committee rules or the House rules? You've told me it's not the House rules. I can only therefore assume it's the committee rules. If it is the committee rules, motions to adjourn and motions to adjourn debate are in order. Why are they not in order in the committee state we're in now?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Because we are in committee of the whole House.

**Mr Stockwell:** Fine. Then, finally, Mr Chair, where in the rule book do I go to see the rules of procedure—

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** Let me tell you where to go.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** We are feverishly looking.

**Mr Stockwell:** I understand that, and I know the member up there, the ex-cabinet minister with the shoe that fell from her mouth, is very interested in hearing this as well. But I ask you, what committee rules do we follow? Where's the rule book that talks about the rules

we follow in the committee of the whole House? I'm very interested in looking them up to find out when an adjournment motion will stand and when a motion to adjourn debate stands.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** I can tell the honourable member that the area he refers to is on page 40, 45(c), and it states as follows: "A motion for the adjournment of a debate or of the House during any debate, or for the Chair of a committee to report progress, or to leave the chair, is not debatable."

**Mr Stockwell:** I understand it's not debatable; I'm asking about the bells and how long they ring. With all due respect, Mr Chair—

**Mrs Haslam:** This is a delaying tactic.

**Mr Stockwell:** The member with the shoe in her mouth wants to get in on this, so maybe we can offer some time to her as well.

Standing order 45(c): "A motion for the adjournment of a debate or of the House during any debate, or for the Chair of a committee to report progress, or to leave the chair, is not debatable." I accept that ruling; I understand that ruling. I'm just asking you now: I would like to move the motion to adjourn debate. How long do the bells ring and what rules do we work under, the House rules or committee rules?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** On page 70, standing order 101: "A committee of the whole House may not adjourn its own meeting or the consideration of any matter to a future date, but this standing order shall not affect the application of standing order 16."

**Mr Stockwell:** With all due respect, Mr Chair, I do not plan on adjourning the committee of the whole for consideration of any matter to a future date. I'm not doing that. I can understand the ruling clearly. I do not plan on adjourning the whole House to a future date; I'm just asking to adjourn the House.

I say through you, the Chair, that if you read this clearly, it says, "A committee of the whole House may not adjourn its own meeting or the consideration of any matter to a future date." I am not adjourning it to a future date; I'm asking you whether a motion to adjourn is in order. I can't find in the standing orders where it says it's out of order. You may not adjourn to a future date; I accept that. But where does it say in the standing orders that a motion to adjourn is in fact out of order?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** It has been ruled by the Chair at this particular point, because we are in committee of the whole, that if you move that we adjourn, it's a motion to rise and report, which would terminate debate.

**Mr Stockwell:** Then can I ask a further question, Mr Chair? Thank you very much for your leniency.

In standing order 102, "Report progress," it says right underneath that: "A motion may be moved during the proceedings of a committee of the whole House that the Chair report progress and ask for leave to meet again, and such question shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate."

When you move a motion to "report progress and ask for leave to meet again," would you then have the same procedures fall in line for a motion to adjourn etc, where

a bell would in fact ring? In fact, if it were adopted, you'd have to come back and meet again as a committee of the whole House?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** If indeed we proceed with your request to adjourn, it would effectively be that the committee would be rising to report and effectively concluding debate.

**Mr Stockwell:** This is the point I'd like to make through you, Mr Chair, to the House, and to you as well. If in fact on page 70, item 102, it said we were in fact adjourning the whole House, "that the Chair report progress," period, I would agree with you. But the difficulty I have is that it doesn't say that.

What it does say is, "A motion may be moved during the proceedings of a committee of the whole House that the Chair report progress and ask for leave to meet again." I am prepared to report progress, but I insist on asking for leave to meet again. Therefore, would it be incumbent on the House to allow time at a future date to meet again, if that is how the motion is structured when asking leave to rise and report?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** I am simply advising the member that if the motion is put, it will be effectively to rise and report. What happens from then on is in the hands of the House.

**Mr Stockwell:** So you're saying that even though this committee of the whole House has said very clearly, "We would like to rise and report, but we insist on asking leave to meet again," the government of the day can overrule a decision made by the Legislature.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** I follow the honourable member, but as it stands now, if the motion occurs it will be to rise and report, and at that point in time if the House decides to rise and report, this terminates debate.

**Mr Stockwell:** But I do not want to move a motion that simply says to rise and report; I want to follow section 102 here. I want to move to rise and report, but I ask leave to meet again, and "such question shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate." So the question I'm asking in my point of order is, how can that be interpreted as saying that I want to rise and report and not meet again, when it says I would like to rise and report and meet again?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The normal procedure is that any time the committee rises and reports, the Chair at the time begs leave to sit again.

**Mr Stockwell:** I understand that. I understand what normal procedure is and I understand what protocol is. I understand all that business. What I'm trying to do is read the rules of this place, and the rules of this place—

*Interjections.*

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Order. We're about ready to terminate debate on this particular item.

1640

**Mr Stockwell:** I understand, Mr Chair, and I thank you very much for your time. But I want to read into the record what the rules of this place say, and they have nothing to do with procedure or decorum or protocol. They have everything to do with the English language,

and the English language says "...committee of the whole House that the Chair report progress and ask for leave to meet again...." Now, that's not protocol, that's not history; that's plain and simple. When you rise in the committee of the whole House and report progress, you can move that motion on the proviso that you ask for leave to meet again.

I'm asking you as Chair, how do you interpret that any differently than those words? We ask leave to meet again.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** And if this occurs and if we ask for leave to sit again, it is in the hands of the committee to decide if indeed we sit again.

**Mr Stockwell:** What committee?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The committee of the whole House.

**Mr Stockwell:** Okay. Then I ask, Mr Chair, through you: You're saying that if we ask for leave to meet again, the government can't unilaterally overrule the decision made by the committee of the whole House. They then must go back into the committee of the whole and ask the committee of the whole not to give them leave to meet again. Is that what you're saying?

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The committee would decide.

**Mr Stockwell:** So it's in the hands of the committee of the whole House.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Which is the committee of the whole House.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** And the House would decide if the committee meets again.

**Mr Stockwell:** So it would be a vote in the Legislature to see. Okay. Thank you. I will not move that then.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** We now can proceed. The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville.

**Mr Runciman:** That was an interesting and rewarding intervention and I very much appreciate the member for Etobicoke West, who is very much concerned about the rules of the House and ensuring that the Chair and the members are abiding by the rules as laid out in the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly.

I was talking about the amendment I put forward. Initially this matter was brought to the attention of myself and the member for Lanark-Renfrew because of two significant employers in our ridings of Leeds-Grenville and Lanark-Renfrew. That employer was Shorewood Packaging. They contacted us, Mr Jordan and myself, to express their concerns about the generic packaging elements of Bill 119, and specifically the amendment brought in by the government members on, I think, the last day of the committee sitting.

They wanted to indicate to us that passage of this legislation, and the subsequent passage of federal legislation which would mandate a national program in respect to generic packaging, would result in significant job losses in both Mr Jordan's riding and mine. They were just apprising us of one firm, Shorewood Packaging, which has a plant in Smiths Falls and a plant in Brockville, Ontario.



The plant in Smiths Falls produces cigarette packaging, and virtually 100% of that Smiths Falls operation is devoted—

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound):** On a point of order, Mr Chairman: I don't believe we have a quorum in the House to listen to this, and I think it's necessary to hear Mr Runciman speak.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Could the clerk check if we do have a quorum, please.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Chair.

*The Second Deputy Chair ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Chair.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville may continue.

**Mr Runciman:** I was in the process of indicating to you the significant job loss that would hit both Leeds-Grenville and Lanark-Renfrew in respect to one firm only that I'm mentioning at this point, Shorewood Packaging.

The owners of Shorewood Packaging indicated to both Mr Jordan and I that there would be the loss of 408 jobs because of the closure of Shorewood Packaging operations in Smiths Falls and Brockville.

As I was indicating earlier, virtually 100% of the Smiths Falls—

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I don't believe a quorum's present.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Do we have a quorum?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Chair.

*The Second Deputy Chair ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Chair.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The member for Leeds-Grenville may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Stockwell:** You ought to change the colour of the package.

**Mr O'Connor:** You want to delay it.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, then, don't sell it. Stop selling it then, Larry. Stop selling cigarettes.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Please, the member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor and is dealing with his amendment.

**Mr Runciman:** I was talking about one element of this and that was the Shorewood Packaging element in respect to Mr Jordan's riding of Lanark-Renfrew and my riding of Leeds-Grenville: 408 jobs. The owners of Shorewood Packaging didn't pull any punches when they met with us. They indicated quite clearly that the institution of generic packaging would result in the closure of their facilities in Ontario.

I want to put on the record why that is indeed the case, why those jobs would be lost:

"The process involves in-line printing and dye cutting utilizing approximately eight separate print stations to lay down various ink colours in series on to the paperboard

substrate to create the finished package. The ink is applied to the substrate via engraved cylinders which carry the reproduction image. Generic packaging would ostensibly require only one colour for brand identification and hence, completely obsolete the existing equipment and skill set used to produce premium tobacco packaging. This would, of course, also suggest no need for the current suppliers' ink manufacturing or cylinder engraving capacity designated to serve the tobacco packaging industry.

"The impact on Shorewood Packaging would be devastating. We would be forced to move our equipment out of the country as it would no longer be required to produce plain, generic packaging. This would affect all of the 220 and 188 people (total 408) employed in Brockville and Smiths Falls respectively."

I want to put on the record a number of other things in respect to job losses. This is just coming together now because of this bill and the fact that packaging firms were not aware of this initiative undertaken by the NDP government and supported by the Liberal Party of Ontario in terms of job losses to Ontario. We're not aware of it.

Not one of these firms appeared before the standing committee before this kind of a decision was taken—I want to emphasize that point—not one packaging firm, not one printing ink firm. These kinds of firms were not afforded the opportunity to at least present their own case before the social development committee before the decision was taken, supported by the NDP and Liberal parties.

1650

I want to put a few more facts on the record. Kromacorp Printing Ink Specialists is another company that's going to be very negatively impacted upon by this move to generic packaging. Kromacorp employs 42 people in Prescott, Ontario. Their business depends on the specialty packaging of cigarette packages. We are hearing from all sorts of people employed at Kromacorp, their relatives, their families, their children, their in-laws, who are very much concerned about this initiative and the impact it's going to have on them, their families, their communities.

But all we get here is joking from the NDP benches, joking and laughing about a matter as serious as these people losing their livelihood. It's a joke for the NDP. It's offensive.

Lawson Mardon: I don't have where that company's located but I will get it later.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Runciman:** It's Mississauga, someone says. It's to lose 130 jobs. Lawson Mardon, 130 jobs, and we're trying to get more information on this as the process evolves.

Roto-Tone Gravure: 25 jobs there.

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I'm afraid once again, Mr Chair, there's not a quorum.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Is a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Chair.

*The Second Deputy Chair ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Chair.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Runciman:** I move adjournment of the House.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** According to standing order 100(a)—

**Mr Murdoch:** Page 70.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Yes, page 70. We've gone through this before and I have to rule the honourable member's motion out of order.

**Mr Stockwell:** I don't think you're reading this properly, Mr Chair, and I'll challenge the ruling of the Chair, sir.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** A challenge to the Chair's ruling has been issued and therefore we will call the Speaker of the House.

*The committee rose and requested a ruling of the Speaker.*

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Mr Speaker, I beg to inform you that a challenge of my ruling has occurred, and I beg your assistance in this matter, sir.

The situation is that the honourable member for Etobicoke West has asked to adjourn the House. We are in committee of the whole and as such it is not in order, in my opinion.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I thank the Chair for his report. All honourable members should know that when the House is in committee of the whole, a motion to adjourn the House is not in order. What is in order is a motion that the committee rise and report. That's always in order and can be voted upon.

The Chair is right. I'm pleased to sustain the ruling of the Chair. You may resume your business.

*House in committee of the whole.*

**The Second Deputy Chair:** We are now in committee, and in my opinion there is nothing out of order.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I certainly don't want to degrade the position of Chair, but with all due respect, and I think the Clerk's table will agree, you didn't actually phrase what my motion was properly, and he had no choice but to rule the way he ruled. I tell you, Mr Chair, that I didn't ask for a motion of adjournment debate. It was a motion strictly with respect to adjournment, and I don't think the Speaker had an understanding of what I was asking for because the phrasing you used was fundamentally incorrect, and I appeal to you, Mr Chair.

1700

**The Second Deputy Chair:** In my recollection with the Speaker's ruling, he advised the committee of the whole that the only point that would be in order was for the committee to rise and report.

The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville can—

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: So the only motion that's in order at this time is a motion to rise

and report? Is that what you're saying? Because I didn't hear—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Stockwell:** With all due respect, and I understand the catcalls from across the floor, Mr Chair, I did not ask for a motion to adjourn debate; I did not ask for that motion to be dealt with by the Speaker. I singularly asked for a motion to adjourn the House. The Speaker ruled on the motion to adjourn the House. I want to be very clear about this because I think it's very important.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** If I recall correctly, I did correct myself and say to adjourn the House and not the debate. I had mentioned debate first and then it did go to the House and the ruling is that it is not in order to adjourn the House. The only thing in order would be to rise and report.

The honourable member for Leeds-Grenville.

**Mr Runciman:** I was putting on the record the number of job losses that are tied in with the move to bring in generic packaging in the province of Ontario.

I mentioned Shorewood Packaging with 408 jobs; Kromacorp Printing Ink Specialists, 42 jobs. Both those plants would close. Lawson Mardon I'm told is in Mississauga, 130 jobs, a plant closure; Roto-Tone Gravure, I don't have information at hand, but we're trying to get that, 25 jobs; Flexible Packaging, I believe this may be in Etobicoke, 180 jobs and a plant closure. We're talking about 785 direct jobs lost as a result of this initiative that we're aware of at this point.

If you use the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology formula that it uses in respect to every manufacturing job creating three other jobs in the service sector, and not even use that ratio, which is accepted by the government and the government ministry, use a more conservative ratio of two jobs created for every one manufacturing job, we are up to the point of 1,100 indirect job losses as a result of this initiative.

So if you total a very conservative estimate of 1,100 indirect job losses and 785 direct job losses that we are aware of as of today, you're talking about almost 1,900 job losses to the province of Ontario as a result of this ill-thought-out initiative on the last day of committee hearings of the standing committee on social development, without any input from the sectors of the industry that are going to be impacted upon, without any input from the people who are going to be impacted upon who are going to lose their jobs: very fine, high-paid jobs in the province of Ontario.

The Minister of Economic Development and Trade and I gather the Premier would give their eye-teeth to attract those kinds of jobs to the province of Ontario, and here we are saying it's okay to get rid of almost 1,900 high-paying jobs in good, clean industries. The industries in Mr Jordan's riding of Lanark-Renfrew and my riding of Leeds-Grenville are fine corporate citizens. They contribute and participate in their communities, they have environmentally spotless records, they have high-paying jobs, they have outstanding records within their communities and I have to assume that the others that are involved in this that we are aware of as of today—



Lawson Mardon, Roto-Tone Gravure and Flexible Packaging—have comparable records within their various communities.

An element which both Mr Jordan and I are starting to hear about is, as I said, the personal side of this. We have the efforts at intimidation by government members which we're hearing here today, that we don't care about people dying of lung cancer, which is offensive, at the very least. We in the Conservative Party care very much.

We also know that there's no clear evidence to indicate that generic packaging is going to have a significant impact in terms of reducing the number of young people who are smoking. Certainly there are arguments on both sides of this, but the government in its lack of wisdom and the standing committee on social development in its lack of wisdom have failed to even take a look at this question.

All Mr Jordan and I and the Conservative Party are attempting to do—and we think it's very reasonable, but we certainly have not had the support of the Minister of Health or her parliamentary assistant in our discussions to this point. We had an initially receptive ear from the Premier, who indicated sincere concern, but he has failed to act upon that expression of concern.

What we're saying is that the committee, at the very least—certainly at the outset the government should have instituted a very thorough investigation of the implications of this kind of initiative being undertaken by the government in the health care field and its impact on young people being attracted to smoking. Clearly, there should have been some kind of objective analysis.

We shouldn't have had this from the lobby groups we hear from on a regular basis who are against smoking, and for the most part I support those people. We shouldn't have had the research being done by those people, because they are certainly not objective. They have a message to deliver, and I think that colours any kind of analysis they would undertake.

We certainly couldn't have supported some kind of analysis or study undertaken by those on the tobacco side of the equation, because again we know they come from a particular perspective with a bias, which we all can appreciate and understand, if not sympathize with.

What the government should have undertaken is an objective assessment through joint ministry effort, I believe, through the Ministry of Health, through the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, and perhaps some other measure through one of the Premier's councils related to job development and job encouragement in this province.

But no such initiative was undertaken. Not even lipservice, as we can understand it, was given to the question of job loss and the implications for the Ontario economy. Almost 1,900 jobs ain't chicken feed. This is not chicken feed. We're talking about very important jobs, well-paid jobs. These people are making \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year, some of them, and the jobs lost are going to have a significant detrimental economic impact on the areas which they will affect. Mr Jordan will be putting some of these on the record as we proceed.

We are of course not wishing to proceed with this quickly, because we want the government to take heed of our concerns. There's been no recognition of that to date. I tried to ask a question of the Minister of Economic Development and Trade in the House today, and what did she do? She tried to fob it off to a minister who had no relationship whatsoever in terms of the job question and who appears—I could be wrong on this, but certainly it appears so—to be a zealot when it comes to this question and falls back again on this whole issue that we're jeopardizing the lives of innocent Ontarians etc, which is a red herring. There's no clear evidence to substantiate that claim, and certainly the committee did not hear, or give opportunity to hear, the other side of the argument.

Both Mr Jordan and I have asked to appear before the federal committee which is taking a look at this legislation so that we can at least have an opportunity to convey our message there, but we're not certain that's going to happen, because now industry representatives, people affected, are aware of what's going on, as they were not aware of what was happening at the Ontario level. They're now aware. We're told the committee looking at this at the federal level now has something like 45 people who wish to appear before it on a waiting list. Mr Jordan and I, the member for Lanark-Renfrew and I, may not have the opportunity to even appear and express the concerns of the people we represent because of the lineup of people now who want to appear before the federal committee.

Certainly many of those people would have liked to have had the opportunity to appear before the standing committee on social development in Ontario if they even had been told, even had been aware of what they were going to do. But that initiative, that undertaking—there was no effort to apprise these people of what the government had in mind.

1710

I know we're going to hear that a member of our caucus was complicit in this effort and supported this effort, and he has since indicated that he thinks that was unfortunate in the way it was approached. He may not change his opinion in respect to generic packaging, but he thinks the way it was handled by the committee was inappropriate and certainly did not afford an opportunity for the people who are going to be impacted upon or the public at large to really have a significant input into this whole question of generic packaging.

I have a letter from Kromacorp Printing Ink Specialists, from a woman who works for the plant, Printing Inks Corp of Canada. She's 33 years old, a married mother of two daughters. She's asking the following question: "What right do our elected politicians have to tell intelligent Canadian citizens whether or not a package of cigarettes should be red, blue, or white and black?"

She indicates: "This is a democratic society and it worries me that my job, along with approximately 500 people just in Leeds-Grenville and Lanark, could be lost because of this. I would like to know what compensation package has been put together when our industry is lost, wiped out because of the ill-thought-out decisions of politicians."

"When I was a young teenager living in a home in which both parents smoked, it was my personal decision based on my own personal beliefs and the information given and taught to me that I decided I did not wish to take up the habit of smoking. I guarantee you it had nothing to do with the colour of the cigarette packages. To this day, I have held firm on that decision.

"The federal and provincial governments that are in power today were put there because they had plans to put people back to work. As a person who spent this past weekend lobbying her friends, neighbours and anyone who would listen, I can guarantee that if this decision goes through, the company that I helped establish 13 years ago, which is the parent company to branches in Toronto and Smiths Falls, will move to the United States.

"If someone had told me the government would force me to humiliate and degrade myself by going to the streets of my home to try and save my job, I would never have believed them. However, I now know that it can and may happen.

"We currently export 60% of our business to the United States. Of the remaining 40%, 90% is tobacco related. It is not economically feasible to keep a Canadian company open just to sell ink to the United States.

"If this decision is made, it would change the way in which the cartons are printed and therefore eliminate the printing jobs as well as jobs in printing ink manufacturing. The bottom line is that it is not a question of whether smoking is legal or not, but a question of whether the government is able to infringe on the freedom of expression and creativity and to put approximately 500 local people out of work, not to mention the domino effect to the province if those people lose their jobs."

I continue with this letter from a lady working for Kromacorp Printing Ink Specialists:

"In years past, it was a degrading and demoralizing experience to have to ask the government for help and accept welfare. Today, in our social environment, children feel that there will be so little choice for them and that the government makes it so easy to be on welfare, it is in actual fact the best way of life: no work, no boss, no stress, few bills.

"I've always been proud of being a working Canadian. It makes me sick to my stomach to see so many young Canadians on the welfare system. With decisions like the one I have outlined in this letter being made on our behalf, will I too soon become another statistic? When will the government learn? Stop playing God. Do the job that the people of Canada and Ontario voted them to do.

"Government officials are voted into office by the people, for the people, not to do what they feel is best. Before making a decision on our behalf, perhaps you should look at the end result. Effective advertising of the effects of tobacco are far better at changing a person's mind on what is right for them. There's nothing worse than telling a child they can't or shouldn't do something. But then again, that is not what you are saying. You are saying if it's in a white box rather than a red box, they won't want to buy cigarettes. We say one has nothing to do with the other.

"Put your efforts towards education rather than eliminating my job. You will have a more economical and perhaps more effective health result in the long run.

"The government caved in to pressure to lower taxes on cigarettes, so this is your next step. If my job and others associated with it are lost, the tax base will be extremely lower as well. In the end, how is the government going to support everyone they put on welfare?

"Please see your way clear to re-evaluate your stand to take on the tobacco industry. They are not the only industry involved. Myself and the Canadian parent company which we are all so proud of need clear-thinking and progressive politicians to return the sorry state of the Canadian and Ontario economies to their once powerful and much-envied status. If we go out of business, the economical loss to the surrounding areas could be devastating."

I want to put another letter on the record. This was from another employee. This is someone from Kroma Printing Inks Corp of Canada, addressed to me, writing in respect to the black and white tobacco packaging which will be enabled through Bill 119 and which my amendments to the bill address.

"Dear Bob,

"I am writing you in regard to the potential legislation of generic tobacco packaging. I am currently employed by Kroma Printing Inks Corp of Canada. The majority of the product produced at our facility is supplied to the tobacco packaging industry. Our company consists of 50 employees, 43 that are based in Prescott, Ontario.

"I am not writing you as a representative of the company but as a representative of my family. I am married and have a five-year-old son, mortgage on a modest home and the usual working stiff debts.

"The two most popular methods of printing used today are the gravure and lithographic methods. Tobacco product packaging is currently printed by the gravure process. This process employs the use of an eight-unit gravure printing press, one unit for each colour, an image printed on any given package.

"If generic packaging is legislated, there would no longer be the need for an eight-colour printing press, and all the packaging designs will be transferred to the lithographic process. The transfer to lithographic does not mean there will be a major creation or transition of jobs and personnel in the lithographic industry. It only means that the current jobs and personnel in the gravure industry will become redundant.

"We are only a gravure ink manufacturer and do not possess the technology or equipment to produce lithographic ink products. Even if we did, what would our chances of survival be, producing only one colour? The gravure printing industry itself will be affected, as will the suppliers of gravure-grade pigments, resins, solvents and additives. The total jobs affected would number in the thousands.

"The proposed generic packaging is black and white. I have observed that one of the most popular colour combinations among today's youth is black and white. Is this legislation intended to promote or deter smoking? I



believe that this may promote the purchase of the more colourfully packaged imported brands and that smokers will be smokers, no matter what. They may have to adjust to reading the labels on the package, instead of recognizing the design.

1720

"Advertisement and packaging is the freedom to express or promote a product. Pushing this legislation due to personal preference is far from democratic. How far do the politicians in Canada intend to go before we lose all freedom of expression and resolve to the fact that we are practising socialist government tactics?"

I guess we shouldn't be surprised by that, given we have a socialist government in Ontario, supported by a quasi-socialist Liberal opposition.

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** We're really on their team, you know.

**Mr Murdoch:** Yes, we know that.

**Mr Mahoney:** But you're the guys who voted with them on the social contract.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Order, please. The member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor, and he is debating his amendment.

**Mr Runciman:** Okay, I want to continue the quotes.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy and Minister Responsible for Native Affairs):** Mr Chair, while I take very seriously the member's comments, I very much appreciate being called a socialist.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Order. The member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor.

**Mr Runciman:** The end of this letter makes reference—I'm finishing off the letter and I'll provide this to Hansard—to the increase of cholesterol. I think this is an appropriate question related to this amendment and this whole question of generic packaging and where it leads us. The final comment in the letter from the employee of Kroma:

"The increase of cholesterol due to the consumption of butter can have an adverse effect on one's health. Where does it all end? Does the government intend to shut down the dairy farmer next?" That should be a special concern of yours, Mr Chairman. "We need to fight this! I don't smoke and I enjoy my freedom to choose not to."

Again, I want to point out the fact that throughout the course of this debate, in case people are viewing through the parliamentary channel, the Conservative Party is attempting to delay this legislation not because we disagree with the basic intent or thrust of the legislation; in fact, we have been supportive. This was a last-minute amendment to the legislation by the government, with no opportunity for input from the public in respect to this amendment. This was brought in during clause-by-clause consideration.

I want the public who are viewing this and people who are concerned about speedy passage of this legislation to understand that this amendment was brought in by the government, not by an opposition member. This amendment was brought in by the NDP government members

on the standing committee on social development during clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 119. There was no opportunity to have input. As I said earlier, not one of the affected industries that we're aware of today, and we suspect there may be even more, had any opportunity whatsoever to put their case forward. Those are the employers we're talking about, let alone the almost 1,900 people who are going to lose their jobs in this province as a result of this ill-thought-out initiative which I think is pure lunacy.

We have over half a million people on the unemployed list in the province of Ontario. We have over one million people on social assistance, I believe it is. If you take that into effect, close to 20% of the Ontario population is out of work, and here we have 1,900 good-paying jobs that this government is prepared to flush down the toilet without even listening to the people affected. I hope the people listening to this program understand, because I've been heckled today by government members who are suggesting that the Conservatives don't care about a health issue. We care deeply.

Do these people understand the implications on health of a person losing a job and not finding another opportunity? There just aren't that many opportunities around, Mr Chairman, as you and I know and those people should know. We have two million people out of work and they're prepared to flush these other people down the toilet. I want to say, what are the health care implications for those people, the stress?

**Mr O'Connor:** What about the 13,000 who die?

**Mr Runciman:** That's the sort of idiocy that we're hearing from the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health. It's totally offensive when he says we don't care about 13,000 people dying of health-related issues. I said we'll pass—

*Interjections.*

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Order.

**Mr Stockwell:** Give me a break. Ban it if you're so concerned. Ban smoking, big talker. Ban it then. You don't care about people dying.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor.

**Mr Runciman:** Obviously, especially to Mr Jordan and me, who are aware at this stage of the very dramatic negative impact on our ridings—other members are just starting to be aware because there's recognition growing of the impact of this legislation. This was something that was snuck through in the dark of the night, in effect, by the committee during clause-by-clause, without any consideration and any care—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Runciman:** —any care or consideration.

**Mr O'Connor:** Mr Chair, on a point of order: Just to clarify the situation, "snuck through" started in January. A discussion paper with this issue in it, January 1993—

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Order.

**Mr O'Connor:** That's what you call "snuck through."

**The Second Deputy Chair:** That's not a point of order. The member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor.

**Mr Runciman:** I think that we have taken a very responsible position in the Conservative Party. We are prepared to expedite the passage of Bill 119, with one very responsible proviso, we feel. The one very responsible proviso is that the government hold back on the elements related to generic packaging, refer them back to the social development committee for full public hearings; get on with Bill 119 and the health care elements that we were concerned about.

They talk about stalling tactics. The reality is, the amendment brought in on the last day was not part of Bill 119 as it was originally tabled by the government. It was not part of the bill, so why is there so much concern about referring that back now so that people who are impacted upon can have an opportunity to appear here and state their case? That's all we're asking for. I think it's eminently reasonable. Instead, we get this heckling from the backbenchers who have nothing better to do. That's what they're paid for, I gather: to sit in here and heckle the opposition when they have really legitimate concerns about almost 1,900 people losing their jobs.

On occasion, sitting as an opposition member, it's extremely depressing to try and make your case and try to be fair, and when you do lose your composure, which I have done on occasion—but I think that anyone watching this cannot hear the heckling, cannot hear the interventions by the members of the government side. I think Mr Jordan and I are supporting a very legitimate option here. We want to see this legislation move ahead as quickly as possible. We simply want this one element to be looked at because it was not looked at by the committee. This was brought in—I have to re-emphasize this—in clause-by-clause, the last day of the committee hearings, no opportunity for testimony, no notification to the interest groups; none whatsoever.

I wonder if a page could get me another glass of water, please.

1730

I have to wonder about how the government members can justify the position they're taking on this. The Liberal opposition, although a member expressed concern about my identification of his party as in support of this particular amendment, the fact is that that's the case. They're ready to speed through third reading, including this amendment with its significant job losses. That's the position of the Liberal Party. That's the position of the NDP. It's only the Conservative Party that's standing up and expressing concern about the loss of 1,900 jobs in the province of Ontario; only the Conservative Party.

People watching this through the parliamentary channel may be wondering about some of the tactics you're seeing utilized here today. Well, there are very few options available to members of the opposition to delay because of the procedural changes brought in first by the Liberal government and the NDP to cut off opposition debate. That's the reason why. So we have to take advantage of the few opportunities available to us as an opposition party to try and delay this.

Clearly, it's our view that this has to be delayed in the hope that we can persuade the government to take another look at what it's doing here and the job losses as

a result of this ill-thought-out initiative and to start to hear the appeals from all of the people who are being impacted upon.

I suspect if one of these industries is located in an NDP riding, we may start to hear a different song being sung over there. I don't know; I'm not sure. Some of the backbenchers don't seem to have the intestinal fortitude even to stand up on behalf of their own ridings. That's the regrettable truth, and we've seen that happen on a number of occasions with respect to the NDP. They're certainly whipped into submission, most of them, even on matters impacting upon their own ridings. It's certainly one of the things that the public at large are turned off about in terms of the whole political process.

That's why we have to do what we have to do. There are a very limited number of options especially—

**Mrs Haslam:** It was Norm Sterling who brought in the amendment.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Order, please.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** Are you serious?

**Mrs Haslam:** Am I serious? I've got the Hansard here.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Order. The member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor.

**Mr Runciman:** Mr Chairman, with all of this heckling from the government members, I would move adjournment of the debate.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The member has moved adjournment of the debate, and the Chair's ruling has to be the same as it was some time ago: that indeed it is not in order to move adjournment of the debate when we are in committee of the whole.

**Mr Murdoch:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: Some time ago I listened with great interest to the debate that the member for Etobicoke West had with you on this very subject, and I would have to agree with the member from Etobicoke, so I would have to challenge your order.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** The member for Grey-Owen Sound has challenged the Chair's ruling, and we therefore must call for the Speaker.

*The committee rose and requested a ruling of the Speaker.*

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Mr Speaker, sir, we are in committee of the whole on Bill 119. A challenge to my ruling on adjournment of the debate, which was moved by the member for Leeds-Grenville, who had the floor very legitimately, has occurred from the member for Grey-Owen Sound. We are asking for your ruling, sir.

**The Speaker:** The House would know that when you are in committee of the whole, a motion to adjourn the debate is not in order. The Chair was right; I've sustained the ruling of the Chair. You may continue with your business.

*House in committee of the whole.*

**The Second Deputy Chair:** We shall now resume debate in committee of the whole on Bill 119. The member for Leeds-Grenville had the floor.



**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Chair: I would just like to seek clarification. Can the member for Leeds-Grenville then pass the floor to the member for—

**The Second Deputy Chair:** We will proceed with the normal rotation.

**Mr Stockwell:** But the member for Leeds-Grenville is not giving up the floor; I'm just asking if that can be done.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Will the member for Leeds-Grenville resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Runciman:** I wanted to again review the point that we in the Conservative Party are not attempting to delay Bill 119 as it was originally submitted to this House and as it was originally submitted to the standing committee on social development. Our caucus discussed Bill 119, debated Bill 119, and supported Bill 119. We supported it in committee.

What we are concerned about, and what this is all about, for the edification of the viewing audience, if no one else, is that in the last day of the committee hearing, the government brought in an amendment in clause-by-clause which was bringing in, in effect, generic packaging.

**Mrs Haslam:** Norm Sterling moved an amendment to bring in generic packaging.

**The Second Deputy Chair:** Order. The member for Perth will have her opportunity. Please. The member for Leeds-Grenville has the floor.

**Mr Runciman:** Mr Chairman, it's difficult to continue, given the efforts of the government not to even listen to our concerns and the heckling that is forthcoming, but I think the message is a very simple one: We are very much concerned about the question of 1,900 job losses in the province of Ontario, at least four plants being closed—

**Mrs Haslam:** And 13,000 deaths, 4,000 young people a month—

**Mr Runciman:** I hear the red herring being thrown across the floor of 13,000 people. I assume that is deaths related in some way, shape or form to smoking. That's a red herring to justify the lack of any effort whatsoever to look into the implications of this generic packaging, not only in the jobs, but there's an assumption on the part of the government members, apparently, to justify their position on this and their lack of caring and lack of consideration on this, that generic packaging is somehow magically going to have an impact on those numbers of people who have health-related illnesses as a result of cigarette smoking. There's nothing to substantiate that in an objective way that we're aware of, and certainly nothing has been done in respect to the job implications.

1740

**Mrs Haslam:** It prevents young people from starting. It's proven in studies. Look up the research. It's about young people; it's about not letting young people start smoking.

**Mr Runciman:** It's difficult, Mr Speaker, to focus when one particular member with a very—it reminds me of a shovel going along the pavement. It has the same

impact on me, that particular voice. I won't mention the member's name.

There's a story about assumptions that I want to put on the record, assumptions the government members are making. The assumption that government members are making is a faulty one, we believe, in respect to health care, although we're prepared to hear that argument, we're prepared to listen to it, and we're prepared to make a decision following that opportunity being provided to everyone who has a view in respect to that issue. We are open to that. We in the Conservative Party are open to hearing that, but we are also open and receptive to hearing what the impact is on job losses, and I think we should and indeed could expand that.

When we take a look at the job loss implications, which as of today total up to 1,900, we should also have people in to testify before the committee about the health cost implications related to people losing their jobs, people who have had solid positions in the community, who have been able to make a contribution to their community, not just in an economic sense but in a social, cultural way, who will find themselves in a very difficult economic situation in the province of Ontario because of no fault of their own, because of an arbitrary decision taken by a provincial NDP government and a federal Liberal government, a decision taken by two governments without even taking the time to listen to their concerns, to take any understanding or appreciation of the implications.

I'd like to put at least one other letter on the record today with respect to this matter, perhaps a few more as the process evolves. This is from a doctor, and the member for Perth may be interested in listening to this if she can stop heckling long enough to listen.

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation and Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs):** If it is a doctor.

**Mr Runciman:** Yes, it is a doctor, a Dr Bukowskyj, who is a doctor of respiratory and internal medicine. We're talking about tobacco packaging here. We're talking about smoking. This could not be more topical in respect to the subject at hand. This is from a Dr Bukowskyj of Kingston, Ontario. This is a letter dated April 11, 1994, and it's addressed to me.

"Dear Mr Runciman:

"Despite the fact that I am not a member of your riding, I am a physician and it has come to my attention that you are not supporting the rapid passage of Bill 119."

He goes on to indicate the question of lung disease, and he makes no reference to any evidence being on the record that plain packaging will have an impact on the question of youth smoking.

**Mrs Haslam:** He supports the bill.

**Mr Runciman:** He is certainly very supportive of Bill 119, there's no question about that, and he would like to see the bill passed without delay. I will put that on the record. Again, I have said earlier today during the course of this debate that we as well believe Bill 119 should be passed quickly. We believe it should be passed quickly in

its original state, the state in which it was introduced, the state in which it received second reading and the state in which it went through a complete process of public hearings. That is the state of Bill 119 which we will support today. We will support speedy passage.

The one fly in the ointment is the fact that on the last day of committee hearings, not a public process—

**Mrs Haslam:** The fly in the ointment is your grandstanding.

**Mr Runciman:** I hear that kind of language from the member for Perth and it's terribly offensive. We hear this sort of thing floating across.

**Mr David Winninger (London South):** The truth always hurts.

**The First Deputy Chair (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Order, please. The member, go ahead.

**Mr Runciman:** To suggest that we're doing this for reasons other than that we care about the impact on our ridings and that we care about what's happening across this province is mean-spirited, to say the least.

I can't speak for other members impacted upon by this, but I can say for the member for Lanark-Renfrew, Mr Jordan, and myself that we've met with employers and we're hearing from employees and their families. We're hearing pleas from the families to do what we can to try and stop this legislation in terms of the element of generic packaging.

We're hearing pleas from families. We're hearing pleas from mothers-in-law, from mothers, children, people who are very concerned about their futures. All we're getting is scoffing and heckling from the NDP members, and ridicule and questions of our sincerity, which I find deeply offensive and I'm sure the member for Lanark-Renfrew finds deeply offensive.

We have every right as members of this Legislature to do what we can in a limited way as members of the opposition to try and make the government understand the concerns of people in our ridings and right across this province. They are legitimate concerns, they are deeply held concerns and they are valid concerns, which this government apparently is not even prepared to listen to.

All we say, and I'll reiterate, is: Take the offensive section, which was brought in on the last day of committee hearings and take it out on a temporary basis. Take it out and move it back to the committee for full—

**Mrs Haslam:** Your party had an amendment for generic packaging.

**Mr Stockwell:** He withdrew it.

**Mr Murdoch:** Listen to what he's trying to tell you.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Interjections are out of order. Members, come to order.

**Mr Stockwell:** He withdrew it, and you put a new one in. You don't know what you're talking about.

**Mr Murdoch:** Ask Sharon. She said she was there, but she didn't hear—

**Mr Stockwell:** They don't know what you're talking about, as usual.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Order.

**Mr Stockwell:** It's hard to believe. Get the shoe out of your mouth; maybe we'd hear better. You don't know what you're talking about. He withdrew it and you put a new one in.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** Oh, is that not right? You want to bet?

**Mrs Haslam:** He brought in his amendment after the generic packaging—

**The First Deputy Chair:** The member for Perth, come to order.

**Mr Murdoch:** It's about time she comes to order.

**The First Deputy Chair:** All interjections are out of order. Would the member continue, please.

**Mr Runciman:** It's going to be interesting as this process evolves. I've been critical. I've been pleading, in effect, with the government members, the parliamentary assistant, the minister. The member for Lanark-Renfrew and myself met with the minister briefly. We briefly discussed this with the parliamentary assistant today, who took a rigid approach, as has the Minister of Health, an inflexible approach, unwilling to deal with our concerns in a meaningful way.

I tried to raise a question with the economic development minister in respect of the role that her ministry plays and that she plays around the cabinet table in terms of the preservation of good, well-paying jobs in this province. It seems to me we have a Jobs Ontario program which this government and its backbenchers are lauding at every possible occasion, and here we have a situation where almost 1,900—and I want to qualify that in the sense that that's what we are aware of as of today. More information came in today in respect of job loss and plant closures, and I suspect even more will be coming to our attention as days go by, as more and more people become aware of this very negative situation.

1750

We're going to do what we can as members of the Conservative Party, but I was getting to the point that I think it's going to be interesting, as this evolves, when we know what the government position is. We will hear that from the parliamentary assistant and I don't think there's going to be any flexibility. He certainly hasn't shown any up to this point in the debate today or any indication of same. It's going to be interesting to hear from the official opposition, the Liberal Party of Ontario.

I described earlier that we're dealing with a socialist party and a quasi-socialist party.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Runciman:** The Minister of Environment and Energy was quick to praise me for describing his party as socialist. I just remind him of the last election when his leader was less than enthusiastic about describing himself and his party as socialists.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** He evaded it.

**Mr Runciman:** He evaded it, right. The member for Simcoe East is quite accurate that the current Premier was very evasive during the election process as to whether indeed he was the leader of a socialist party or not, but now that they're in government, clearly there's



no question in anyone's mind that we have a socialist party in power.

The other question is that I have described the Liberal Party as a quasi-socialist party. Certainly we saw that there was great comfort in the two parties during the 1985-87 period when they linked arms together in the socialist accord of 1985-87 which put Mr Peterson in power with Bob Rae pulling a lot of the strings and getting his friends like Elie Martel, Donald MacDonald and others appointed to significant, important government positions.

It's going to be interesting. One member of the Liberal Party took offence at me describing them as quasi-socialists and the fact that they support this measure which is going to cost almost 1,900 jobs in Ontario that we are aware of. What's going to be interesting as this debate evolves is to see if any Liberal member even participates in this debate on this particular amendment.

**Mr Bisson:** If you give them a chance.

**Mr Runciman:** We'll give them a chance, don't worry about it, but I suspect that if they do take up the opportunity to speak, they're not going to speak in support of my amendment. They're going to speak in support of the government NDP amendment which is going to bring generic packaging to Ontario and is going to result in at least 1,900 lost jobs; good jobs in clean, environmentally sound industries, industries that contribute to their communities and play a significant role in their communities.

Perhaps I shouldn't jump to these kinds of conclusions in respect to the decisions taken by the Liberal Party of Ontario. They are making some strange sounds lately with an election on the horizon, even moving into some areas that were previously the sole purview of the Conservative Party of Ontario.

Strangely, we see the leader of the Liberal Party trying to infringe on some of those areas now to try and moderate the image of the party so it's not so clear to Ontario voters that they're dealing with a socialist and a quasi-socialist party. She's trying to muddy the waters, in some respect, but I don't believe it's going to be effective.

I want to put a few other matters on the record and I want to apologize in respect to Dr Bukowskyj, just to make sure the record is clear, that he is indeed very supportive of Bill 119 and wants to see speedy passage as do members of the Conservative Party if indeed we are given any consideration in respect to our concerns about job loss.

All we're asking for is that we be given an opportunity to discuss this fully with members of all three parties in the Legislature and that the people who are going to be impacted upon have an opportunity in terms of time to make their case in respect to this matter and then bring the measure back to the House.

If the government and the Liberal Party are still convinced that this is the way to go, I'm sure that we in the Conservative caucus are prepared to say that we will not hinder the passage of that initiative at a future date, if indeed full public hearing opportunities are provided. We will not hinder that if it comes back to the House in

much the same form that currently exists. We will oppose it, we will speak to it, but we will not in any undue fashion try to delay the measure at that point in time being incorporated because we will have had an opportunity, the public will have had an opportunity, the industries affected and the people affected will have had an opportunity to state their case.

If the government doesn't want to accept their case, if the Liberal Party doesn't want to accept their case, if both of those parties are not concerned in any significant way about the major job losses that are going to occur and the impact on the people affected and the economy of Ontario, so be it. So be it; that's the case.

Our concern at this juncture is that no such opportunity has been afforded or is being afforded or being suggested or being offered. In fact, we're being told by the parliamentary assistant and by the minister: "We're inflexible on this. We're going ahead on this with the blinkers on, in a zealot-like fashion. We have only one goal in mind and that's to try and appease," I assume, "some of the people who were upset about the reduction in taxation on cigarettes."

They're trying to appease those people who are significant lobbyists around this place; let's accept that. The people losing their jobs and the industries that are being closed don't have paid lobbyists running around the halls of Queen's Park. The people on the other side of this issue do, we know. Even when I raised concerns about this issue a couple of weeks ago there was immediately a missive in the mail expressing concern about any delay that we might cause in terms of speedy passage of this bill. There were phone calls made and I'm sure I'm not the only member of the Legislature who received a message from people who lobby this place on a fairly regular basis.

The people we're talking about, the folks who are going to be losing their jobs, the people who are going to see their industries close down, the municipalities that are going to lose a significant chunk of their tax base and have their welfare rolls expanded upon, those people don't have lobbyists around here. They don't have people to twist arms. They're not contributing to political campaigns. They are honest, hardworking, law-abiding citizens doing the best for themselves and their families and their communities, and this government and the Liberal Party are not even prepared to listen to them.

I want to tell you—I don't want to mislead anyone—I think the House leader perhaps on the government side did not appreciate the depth of feelings in the Conservative Party on this issue.

**Mr O'Connor:** You wait till we bring out about your years of inaction.

**Mr Runciman:** We're talking about jobs here and I don't care if you bring out—you can bring out comments and I'm sure you will. You'll play that game, and that is a game. That's a game with people's lives that you want to play. You want to play a game with people's lives. That's what you're doing.

**Mr O'Connor:** People's lives are important. You don't care; you're delaying it. You're in here delaying it.

**Mr Stockwell:** Why did you lower the taxes, then, Larry? Why did you lower the taxes on cigarettes if you were so concerned?

**The First Deputy Chair:** Order.

**Mr Stockwell:** Why did you lower the taxes?

**The First Deputy Chair:** Order. Mr Runciman, this may be a good time to break off your remarks.

*Interjections.*

**The First Deputy Chair:** Order. Mr Runciman, this would be a good time to break off your remarks.

**Mr Runciman:** I'm sorry, Madam Chair, I'm really having difficulty and I would encourage my own members as well as the government members to give me an opportunity to hear you.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Seeing it is almost 6 o'clock, this would be an appropriate time to break off your remarks.

**Mr Runciman:** What's the appropriate procedure here? I want to ensure that we're procedurally correct in respect to this so that we don't—

**The First Deputy Chair:** If you could take your seat, the minister will move adjournment.

**Mr Runciman:** I'm not giving up the floor, am I?

**The First Deputy Chair:** No.

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that the committee rise and report progress.

**The First Deputy Chair:** Mr Charlton has moved that the committee of the whole rise and report. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour please say "aye."

All those opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

I declare the motion carried.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** The committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again. Shall the report be received and adopted?

All those in favour please say "aye."

All those opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

I declare the motion carried.

It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 1802.



# CONTENTS

Tuesday 12 April 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Underground economy</b>                  |      |
| Mr Callahan                                 | 5527 |
| <b>Curling championships</b>                |      |
| Mr Cousens                                  | 5527 |
| <b>Wilson Brooks</b>                        |      |
| Ms Akande                                   | 5527 |
| <b>Linhaven Home for the Aged</b>           |      |
| Mr Bradley                                  | 5527 |
| <b>Violence against women</b>               |      |
| Mrs Witmer                                  | 5528 |
| <b>Assistance to farmers</b>                |      |
| Mr Hayes                                    | 5528 |
| <b>Ministry relocation</b>                  |      |
| Mr Grandmaitre                              | 5528 |
| <b>Sports and recreation funding</b>        |      |
| Mr Arnott                                   | 5528 |
| <b>Guelph International Resource Centre</b> |      |
| Mr Fletcher                                 | 5529 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|                                |                  |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Social assistance</b>       |                  |
| Mr Conway                      | 5530             |
| Mr Silipo                      | 5530, 5533       |
| Mr Harris                      | 5533             |
| <b>Emergency services</b>      |                  |
| Mr Conway                      | 5531             |
| Mrs Grier                      | 5532, 5533, 5535 |
| Mr Miclash                     | 5532             |
| Mr Jim Wilson                  | 5535             |
| <b>Gun control</b>             |                  |
| Mr Harris                      | 5534             |
| Mr Christopherson              | 5534             |
| <b>Video lottery terminals</b> |                  |
| Mr McClelland                  | 5535             |
| Ms Churley                     | 5535             |
| <b>Seneca College campus</b>   |                  |
| Mr Mammoliti                   | 5536             |
| Mr Cooke                       | 5536             |

## Workplace Health and Safety Agency

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Mr Mahoney   | 5537 |
| Mr Mackenzie | 5537 |

## Anti-tobacco legislation

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Runciman | 5538 |
| Mrs Grier   | 5538 |

## Assisted housing

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Ms Harrington | 5538 |
| Ms Gigantes   | 5539 |

## Referral of question

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| Mrs Cunningham | 5539 |
| Mr Wildman     | 5539 |
| Mr Runciman    | 5539 |
| Mr Eves        | 5539 |
| Ms Lankin      | 5539 |
| Mr Callahan    | 5540 |

## PETITIONS

|                           |      |
|---------------------------|------|
| <b>Sexual orientation</b> |      |
| Mr O'Neil                 | 5540 |
| Mr Wessinger              | 5542 |

## Haemodialysis

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Mr Jim Wilson | 5540 |
|---------------|------|

## Education financing

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Mr Malkowski | 5540 |
|--------------|------|

## Medical examinations

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Cleary | 5541 |
| Mr North  | 5542 |

## Firearms safety

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Mr Villeneuve | 5541 |
| Mr Jim Wilson | 5541 |
| Mr Sutherland | 5541 |
| Mr Mills      | 5542 |
| Mr North      | 5542 |

## Land-lease communities

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Mrs Mathysen | 5541 |
|--------------|------|

## Violence

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| Ms Poole | 5541 |
|----------|------|

## FIRST READINGS

|                                      |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| <b>City of Brampton Act, 1994,</b>   |      |
| Bill Pr107, Mr McClelland            |      |
| Mr McClelland                        | 5542 |
| Agreed to                            | 5542 |
| <b>Coroners Amendment Act, 1994,</b> |      |
| Bill 148, Mr Jackson                 |      |
| Mr Jackson                           | 5542 |
| Agreed to                            | 5542 |
| <b>Town of Napanee Act, 1994,</b>    |      |
| Bill Pr70, Mr Paul Johnson           |      |
| Mr Paul Johnson                      | 5542 |
| Agreed to                            | 5542 |

## SECOND READINGS

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| <b>Liquor Control Amendment Act, 1993,</b> |                  |
| Bill 113, Ms Churley                       |                  |
| Ms Churley                                 | 5543             |
| Mr Tilson                                  | 5543, 5548       |
| Mr McClelland                              | 5544, 5546       |
| Mr Duignan                                 | 5546, 5548, 5549 |
| Mr Eves                                    | 5546             |
| Agreed to                                  | 5550             |

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

|                                   |                  |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Tobacco Control Act, 1993,</b> |                  |
| Bill 119, Mrs Grier               |                  |
| Mr O'Connor                       | 5550             |
| Mr Runciman                       | 5551, 5553, 5555 |
| Report adopted                    | 5563             |

## OTHER BUSINESS

|                              |      |
|------------------------------|------|
| <b>Visitor</b>               |      |
| The Speaker                  | 5529 |
| <b>Order of business</b>     |      |
| Mr Mahoney                   | 5529 |
| Mr Charlton                  | 5529 |
| The Speaker                  | 5529 |
| <b>Seneca College campus</b> |      |
| Mr Sorbara                   | 5530 |

# TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 12 avril 1994

## PREMIÈRE LECTURE

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 modifiant la Loi sur les coroners, projet de loi 148,</b> |      |
| M. Jackson   | 5542 |
| Adoptée  | 5542 |

## DEUXIÈME LECTURE

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Loi de 1993 modifiant la Loi sur les alcools, projet de loi 113,</b> |      |
| M <sup>me</sup> Churley   | 5543 |
| Adoptée   | 5550 |

## COMITÉ PLÉNIER

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE</b>  |      |
| <b>Loi de 1993 sur la réglementation de l'usage du tabac, projet de loi 119,</b> |      |
| M <sup>me</sup> Grier  | 5550 |



No. 112

N° 112

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 13 April 1994

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

Mercredi 13 avril 1994

Speaker  
Honourable David WarnerPrésident  
L'honorable David WarnerClerk  
Claude L. DesRosiersGreffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers*50th anniversary**1944–1994**50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 13 April 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 13 avril 1994

The House met at 1332.

Prayers.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS CHEQUE CASHING BILL

**Mr Gilles E. Morin (Carleton East):** This government wants to save money. Bill 154, the cheque cashing act, would save millions of dollars. It awaits third reading, since December 1991. The government has done nothing since then.

It continues to condone the appalling practice of charging fees to people who cash social assistance cheques. Before 1990, it was so good at wringing its hands over the plight of the needy. Today it allows unscrupulous businesses to prey upon the most vulnerable members of our society.

Bill 154 benefits both the government and low-income persons. It ensures that public funds are spent responsibly and meet their intended objective. Taxpayers expect this. Bill 154 also protects low-income persons by guaranteeing that they will receive the full amount of the assistance to which they are entitled. This is common sense. Why this government continues to subsidize cheque-cashing businesses makes no sense at all.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services recently announced measures dealing with fraud and other issues. It could have acted more than two years ago. Without Bill 154, money will continue to be lost, causing needless hardship to low-income Ontarians and proving once again, to the detriment of Ontario, that this government is inconsistent and careless in its handling of public funds.

## FOREST INDUSTRY

**Mr Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew):** This statement is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Nearly a year has passed since I raised the issues of excessive stumpage fees and taxation on the forest industry with this minister. At a press conference on Monday, in Thunder Bay, the minister announced plans to overhaul the stumpage fee system.

I find it appalling that the minister would announce a massive change in forest policy without making a statement in this House. Instead, the minister distanced himself from any accountability and denied members' input into this process.

In the minister's letter to the forest industry leaders, he states that stumpage fees will be reformed to address the "shortcomings of the existing system." I am pleased to see the minister can now publicly acknowledge that there are shortcomings in the existing system. Unfortunately, he did not specify.

The specific shortcoming, as told by loggers throughout Ontario, is that stumpage fees are too high and have

killed jobs. Now that the minister realizes that fundamental changes must be made to the stumpage fee system, it begs the question, why did he go for the \$25-million tax grab in the first place?

## YWCA AWARDS

**Ms Jenny Carter (Peterborough):** I want to congratulate the four women who were honoured by the YWCA in Peterborough at the annual awards dinner on April 7 and to express my appreciation to the YWCA for making these awards.

Barbara Beck and Lynn Hill are recipients of the 1994 Women of Distinction award for their community commitment and their work to improve the status of women. Megan Hillman and Kathrin Mertens are the first winners of the new Women of Distinction Youth award for women aged 16 to 21.

Barbara Beck is executive director of the Senior Citizens' Council of Peterborough and chairperson of the Peterborough Theatre Guild board of directors and of the Elder Abuse Network of Peterborough.

Lynn Hill, manager of the George Street Municipal Trust, is a lifelong resident of Peterborough committed to improving local economic conditions, especially relating to women.

Megan Hillman is one of the longest-standing volunteers with the Peterborough AIDS Resource Network.

Kathrin Mertens is a local rower who received two gold medals at the Canada Summer Games in Kamloops, BC, last summer.

Each of these women has made a unique and valuable contribution to our community. They all deserve our recognition and thanks. Well done, all of you.

## PENSION FUNDS

**Mrs Elinor Caplan (Orillia):** Today we have another example of how Bob Rae and his government pander to union leadership while he cooks the province's books.

The government is reducing the amount it pays into the new OPSEU pension plan by \$390 million in exchange for giving up control of the plan. In the deal, the government will contribute less towards each OPSEU member's pension but the government will share control of managing the pension plan with OPSEU. I would note that the government still has sole responsibility for deficits and the unfunded liability of \$1.7 billion.

There are many questions about this new plan. For example, who will decide when the partners can't agree?

I believe that by doing this Bob Rae will simply use the \$390 million to try to fool the voters into thinking that the province's financial picture is better than it really is. The Provincial Auditor has even said that what this NDP government is doing with the province's financial



statements is not proper accounting practice. This OPSEU deal is another example of Bob Rae's willingness to play fast and loose with the way the province keeps its books.

Mr Premier, you're not fooling the financial community, the private sector or the taxpayers of Ontario. They see through this. They know this is not in the taxpayers' interests. It may not be in the pensioners' interests. It is only in the interest of the leadership of OPSEU.

1340

#### NIAGARA ESCARPMENT COMMISSION

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound):** I would like to focus attention once again on the unfair and inflexible practices of the Niagara Escarpment Commission.

Over the past two years the Owen Sound Minor Soccer Association has been investigating ways to develop more playing fields for its sport. Soccer is the second-largest sports organization in the city, with over 800 children actively involved.

In 1992 the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority suggested the Pottawatomi Conservation Area as a possible site for a new soccer complex. The area is unused farm land purchased as part of a parcel by the authority in order to obtain the upper level of the Niagara Escarpment. The land is flat and would be a perfect site for 11 new grass soccer fields. Soccer would not be the only use of the lands as picnic areas, bicycle and walking trails would be incorporated into the overall design by the authority. In addition, with an onsite gravel parking lot more residents and visitors would have access to the beauty of the escarpment and the Bruce Trail.

After countless hours to develop a plan and make application, approval was obtained in principle from the city of Owen Sound, Derby township and the conservation authority but was denied by the NEC. The soccer association followed with an appeal but was again denied by the ministry on the grounds that, "They could see no relationship between soccer and the escarpment environment." Apparently, open fields are not compatible with the escarpment plan.

For this example I think we can all see why Grey county is continually frustrated with the commission. This is just another reason why the NEC should be disbanded and the control should be given back to local municipalities. I sincerely hope that by bringing this matter to the attention of the minister, he will reconsider his decision or at least have the courtesy of approaching me for further discussion.

#### PURCHASE OF PAPER MILL

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** In October 1993 our Premier and I attended the opening of the new thermomechanical pulp mill at Spruce Falls in Kapuskasing. We were proud at the time to be able to say that since the employee buyout two years before, the mill was now generating profits and expanding.

Now, only six months later, Spruce Falls has just had yet another news announcement: The second phase of the \$43-million sawmill complex is now in operation. The sawmill project represents the first major permanent workforce expansion at Spruce Falls in over 20 years.

Some 95 full-time employees will be required to

operate the facility on its planned three-shift, five-day operation schedule. In addition, the equivalent of a further 31 full-time jobs will be required in the company's wood harvesting operation to satisfy the increased tree length requirements. That's a total of 126 new full-time jobs at Spruce Falls since the employee buyout in 1991. Construction of the sawmill should also produce an estimated 400 to 500 temporary jobs in the coming year.

I'd like to take this opportunity to stress once again the importance of the employee buyout to the economic stability of Cochrane North, the success of its employees and their contribution in turning the company around full-circle, and the benefits to the community at large with the number of jobs that have been saved and created since then.

I think we can all proudly say that Spruce Falls has proven to become one of the greatest models for employee-owned businesses in the entire country.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mrs Yvonne O'Neill (Ottawa-Rideau):** There was another important press conference at Queen's Park this morning, the second time in as many months that people came and reminded the NDP government of its trail of broken promises.

This time it was the Coalition for Social Assistance Reform, individuals who in their spirit of social responsibility are doing the best to remind every member of this Legislature, but especially the NDP members, that people on social assistance, more than 500,000 of whom are children and 150,000 are persons with disability, have the right to be treated with dignity and respect.

All the social assistance recipients are asking for is an opportunity to do something meaningful with their lives. The coalition reminded us again that welfare-bashing, although considered by some to be expedient, is cheap and inaccurate and simplistic. These victims of economic insecurity stated that they have no comfort, that they are demoralized and that they have been, in their grief, defrauded of their dignity.

They came to Queen's Park this morning to destroy the myth-making, to set the record straight and to launch their campaign, a campaign to educate the people of Ontario about what living on welfare is really like. I join them in the beginning of their campaign and hope they can destroy the myths.

#### HEALTH CARDS

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I would like to urge the Minister of Health to deal with an issue that the Ontario Progressive Conservatives have brought up in this House on many occasions. The proliferation of health cards that are being issued by the Ministry of Health must stop.

I called the ministry to ask how to go about getting a new health card. I was told that it was not necessary to send my original card back, and sure enough, I now have in my possession two health cards. I have it on good authority that both health cards would be accepted in emergency rooms across Ontario, assuming I do not need emergency care in Red Lake. The unfortunate part of this situation is that the physician and hospital that look after

me will get stung when they submit their account for payment to the Ministry of Health.

Minister, when are we going to see action on this issue? Yes, you inherited a flawed system from the Liberals. Yes, the government is dealing with a debt larger than Ontario has ever seen, most of it self-inflicted. But, Minister, we need to see some leadership on this. We need to see action: action that goes beyond refusing to pay doctors for services they have provided because you issue new health cards without requesting the old one back.

The doctors have no way of checking the validity of a health card in emergency situations, because your government hasn't set up a system. It is unfair for your ministry to refuse payment to doctors when they don't have a validation system available for their use.

Your government is dealing with this by hitting the hospitals and doctors and not stopping the duplication at the source, your ministry.

#### SCIENCE FAIR

**Mr Gary Wilson (Kingston and The Islands):** Last Saturday, 260 elementary and secondary students displayed their science projects as part of the 23rd annual Kingston and District Science Fair. Also participating were 70 judges who are working scientists drawn from the post-secondary, research and commercial sectors in the Kingston area.

I toured the fair Saturday morning and can attest to the enthusiasm and creativity of the students. Like the many other visitors to the two-day fair, I learned about subjects like electromagnetism, solar batteries, water filtration and optical illusions.

Mr Speaker, you'll get a greater sense of the range of subjects displayed from the following list of winners and their projects: gold, Stefanie Smith, Kingston Collegiate and Vocational Institute, for Licorice and Epilepsy; silver, Catherine Tremblay, KCVI, for Sémiologie: Le sens joue cache-cache; bronze, Elizabeth Tremblay, Regiopolis/Notre-Dame, for Où va le vent qui vient; honourable mention, Kate Higginson, KCVI, for Light Sensitivity of Photographic Emulsions.

Of course, everyone in the community is a winner in an event like this. The students, for example, are able to discuss their projects with working scientists. This strengthens their sense of pride and accomplishment as well as their understanding of the subject. The judges, in return for the generous donation of their time, get a sense of the level of science instruction in our schools. They also have the satisfaction of knowing they are encouraging in these novice scientists a love for science that can be both personally and socially rewarding. Parents can be pleased at the opportunity for exploration and creativity these science projects provide their children. And the community exposure to science, an activity crucial to our individual and collective wellbeing, will benefit us all.

I wish to commend science fair's co-chairs, Heather Highet and Elizabeth Turcke, their committee and community sponsors for commitment to such a worthwhile event. And good luck to Kingston winners at the Canada-wide science fair in May.

#### BUSINESS PRACTICES

**Mr Will Ferguson (Kitchener):** Every week, hundreds of residents of this province are being ripped off by loan brokers, and I think it's high time that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations took some action to put these bandits out of business.

Once again, another one of my constituents visited my office to tell a tale of woe. She gave a loan brokerage firm \$650 in order to process an application for a \$26,000 loan. What was interesting about the process is that my constituent made the application by phone and was called back within 24 hours to be told that she was indeed approved for a \$26,000 loan, providing that she come up with a cool \$650 to process the application. Of course, she made the usual inquiries and was given the usual assurances that the application had been approved and that she had absolutely nothing to worry about. Well, today it's two months later and she has not seen her \$650, nor has she seen any of the \$26,000 loan.

It's our job to protect the citizens of Ontario, and we should be taking strict action with these individuals. I'm calling today on the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations to conduct an inquiry to determine just how many of these individuals who have applied for loans really have obtained loans. It's clear to me that these firms are doing for the consumers of Ontario what the James brothers did for the western banks.

1350

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### GUN CONTROL

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** My first question today is to the Premier, the leader of the government. Premier, you and all members of the House will know that earlier today Mrs de Villiers and her community group, concerned about safe and secure communities, came to this Legislature, and I say to you, Premier, that this is a question for you.

I have a second question for the minister of justice, but as leader of the government I want to ask you to deal with a couple of the concerns that I think are everywhere, inside this chamber and outside, about safe and secure communities.

Mrs de Villiers and her group came today to indicate their concern and their growing frustration about the problems that are out there that are not being addressed. I want to ask a first question to the Premier around a constructive idea that has been raised in this House and raised elsewhere, certainly in the regional municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, and that is the business about the gun exchange. That is an idea that we support in this caucus, and that, as far as I can judge, everybody in this Legislature supports.

My first question to you, Mr Premier, as leader of the government: Are you prepared today to give a commitment on behalf of the government of Ontario, which you lead, that you will immediately support the police in Metropolitan Toronto in their very creative and constructive gun exchange program, and that you will, as leader of your government, support any other municipality in the province that initiates a similar gun exchange program?



**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'd like to refer that to the Solicitor General.

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** Today I received in my office an open letter from the leader of the third party as a follow-up to his question and our dialogue here in the House yesterday. In it he acknowledges his appreciation for the fact that the government was receptive to an idea from an opposition bench that could have an impact on public safety.

As I indicated to this House and to the media and the public yesterday, we are interested in this idea. I have already asked staff to begin the work necessary to ensure that if we were to follow such a program, we are putting in place the kinds of measures that will make it as effective as possible, and indeed, if there are any concerns, that we are at least aware of those as we walk down that road.

I continue to articulate on behalf of the government that we are receptive to this. I'm pleased to see that the official opposition is equally receptive and apparently very comfortable with this idea, and we'll continue to see progress on this front.

**Mr Conway:** All of us have a responsibility and clearly it's time to act on certain things, and this seems to be an idea whose time has come. In fact, Ontario just two years ago participated in a similar kind of program.

My second question to the Solicitor General has to do with a related issue. In Ottawa, just a few weeks ago, we had a horrific example, and the police are telling my colleagues and myself that in that horrific drive-by shooting what we had was a situation where an innocent bystander was shot with an illegal weapon—but with store-bought bullets.

We have a situation today where criminals are killing and maiming people, innocent people in this province, often with illegal weapons but almost always with store-bought bullets. Earlier today I asked one of the younger members of my staff to walk over to Yonge Street. It took four minutes to go down to the corner of Yonge and Wellesley and buy, easily and without question, bullets for some of the most deadly handguns available on the street in this city.

Given the fact that the Ontario government has responsibilities in this area, will the government of Ontario, through you, Mr Minister, give an undertaking that you will require minimally that no one in this province is going to be able to buy this kind of ammunition, these, in this case, 9mm Luger full metal case? I'm told by your officials—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member complete his question, please.

**Mr Conway:** —that there are virtually no requirements, no regulations, about the purchase of this.

A constructive suggestion: Will you and your government consider that you will require in this province a valid Ontario hunting permit or licence, or its equivalent, before an individual can buy this kind of deadly material?

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** I'm going to answer very directly at the end of my comments, but I do want to say that at the very recent federal-provincial justice ministers'

conference, Ontario played a leading role at the table in urging the federal government to not see Bill C-17, which was the federal civilian gun control legislation, be the end of the work that is done in this nation but indeed the starting point. I have offered the commitment of my ministry and that of my colleague the Attorney General in this regard, as I have carriage of this issue on behalf of the government, to ensure that the kinds of progressive gun control and related issues that need to be in place indeed are.

There needs to be a very comprehensive response. I don't think a piecemeal response to this issue is what's needed. Neither, to refer to the comments of the leader of the third party, do we need to have so many commissions and reports that we're never getting on with it. But we do need to make sure, when we respond to the public as legislators and say, "This is what we're doing," and honestly believe it's going to have an impact, that indeed we have thought it through and ensured that all the pieces are considered, that they all fit and that they all support one another.

To answer your question directly, yes, this government is very much interested in looking at the issue of ammunition and how it is made accessible, that being just one piece—

**The Speaker:** Could the minister complete his response, please.

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** —of a whole host of civilian gun control regulations and police, smuggling, federal-related issues with regard to the enormous amount of weaponry that is coming across the border. All of these things we embrace and feel that we need to be moving on.

**Mr Conway:** It is clear that this, we as a province can do. My legal advisers make it very plain that this kind of regulation of the retailing of this kind of deadly weaponry is clearly and entirely within our jurisdiction. You know, when I look at this box of deadly weaponry which can be bought by just about anyone, young or old, in this province, there is a message printed: "Keep out of the reach of children."

1400

It is clear that children, or near-children, can buy these kinds of bullets in this province. This Legislature over the years, and presently under the leadership of your colleague the Minister of Health, has imposed and is imposing restrictions on access to our highways, access to the purchase of alcohol, access to tobacco. Surely we would all agree, Minister, that the time has come to impose a reasonable control on the sale of these kinds of bullets. Because I repeat, a real part of the problem, according to people like the chief of police in Ottawa—

**The Speaker:** Could the member place his question, please.

**Mr Conway:** —is that criminals are killing and maiming people in this province using illegal guns, but with store-bought bullets.

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** Let me say again that I appreciate the suggestion put forward by the honourable member. As I have indicated, the short and straight

answer to his question is yes, this government is very much interested in looking at responsible control of access to ammunition.

I would suggest, though, to the honourable member, with a great deal of respect, and I mean this so sincerely, that it was his leader a few days ago who stood in her place and suggested that what was needed was a chance to have a thoughtful debate to look at all these issues, that there wasn't any one thing that was going to do it, that there wasn't any one particular action. I would suggest from that, by extension, that this idea and other matters would be a part of what she was suggesting when she said, would the government agree to participate in an all-party, non-partisan approach to crime prevention?

I would suggest that if we find ourselves in that position, this issue, as well as a number of others that have already been mentioned and some that won't—the one thing we don't want to do is answer yes to whatever hot issue comes up in the House here and then let all of this be forgotten in a few weeks because it's not on the front pages. We need to deal with this in a comprehensive way. I believe that's what the opposition has offered. I have undertaken to respond to that shortly, and I understand discussions are currently under way in that regard.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mr Conway:** A new question on a similar subject, to the minister of justice.

But let me just say that these people in the gallery, some of whom have suffered terribly as a consequence of problems in our criminal justice system, are telling all of us and giving the government a failing grade, or at least the Premier a failing grade, because they are frustrated that all they're hearing is talk and not enough action.

There are clearly some things that we as a provincial Legislature and you as a provincial government can do to act, and a better regulation of the sale of bullets, using a valid Ontario hunter's licence, for which you must take and pass a test, is, it seems to me, a practical and constructive suggestion.

#### JUSTICE SYSTEM

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North):** My second question is to the minister of justice.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Briefly.

**Mr Conway:** My second question concerns what happens in this province to those criminals who have committed violent offences using firearms. People like Mrs de Villiers and her group have rightly pointed out the ongoing problems with our criminal justice system, problems related to sentencing, problems related to plea bargaining, problems related to parole, problems related to bail. It is obvious that there are serious ongoing shortcomings in all of those areas that are causing great concern, but more importantly, causing great injury to many people in this province.

Minister, the Ontario criminal justice system is not working. These people among others have identified some glaring difficulties. Will you move to fix the problems?

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** First of all

I'd like to join the member in talking about how valuable the input has been from the CAVEAT group, indeed from the coroners' juries that have looked at issues such as the Yeo case or the Stephenson case and how important that feedback has been to us in our revamping of the criminal justice system.

It is quite true that there are a number of recommendations that have come forward from those inquests that have not yet been fully implemented and a very few that have been rejected, but as the member is aware, there are many that have been wholeheartedly adopted and indeed have been put into place, have been fully implemented, with the gratitude of those working in the criminal justice system, particularly our crown attorneys and many of those who are involved in the administration of justice.

We acknowledge and honour the kind of contribution that groups like CAVEAT and the various coroners' juries have made in pointing out the shortcomings of our system and giving us some very clear information about what would appear to be better justice to those who are looking at these very serious cases.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude her response, please.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** I think the member is well aware that many of the issues he raised are not within my jurisdiction but where I have indicated my very strong willingness to work with our federal counterparts. Changes to the Criminal Code, changes to sentencing practices, are very serious issues. Indeed, at our recent federal-provincial-territorial meetings, the whole issue of how to turn our criminal justice system into a system that deals in an effective and speedy way with serious interpersonal violence was the focus in every single minister's mind.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister please conclude her response.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** The look at the dangerous offenders issues, the following of high-risk offenders like Mr Yeo, are very serious concerns, and I certainly can assure the member that I dedicate myself to doing what I can during my period in office to try and meet the needs that have been identified.

**Mr Conway:** I'd like to follow up with a particular issue that falls entirely within the minister's jurisdiction, and that concerns plea bargaining. Minister, you have an agent in every court in this province, and those agents are the crown attorneys. People who have committed violent offences involving firearms often have the firearm-related offence traded away at a plea bargaining session.

Will you, minister of justice, recognizing the gravity of concern we all feel about violent crimes involving the use of firearms, and recognizing that we would never, and do never, allow plea bargaining around a drunk driving charge, for example, direct immediately all crown attorneys in this province to cease and desist from any and all plea bargaining around gun-related offences, particularly in their association with violent crimes?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** That's easy for me to do, because in fact our crown policy directives are very clear that section 85 offences are not to be part of plea bargaining



in most instances. There are a couple of exceptions, and that's where there is a series of bank robberies and that sort of thing where the total cumulative effect of sentencing would not make sense. In that case, there's a somewhat different process, but our crown policy directive very clearly states that plea bargaining is not appropriate around section 85 offences.

I would certainly say to the member that the concern of crown attorneys is very often that all they see is the minimum sentence, which is a year, as opposed to the kind of sentence they ask for in response to section 85 issues.

So that is the policy. I can certainly tell the member that the crown law office views very seriously the whole issue of how early resolution of matters appearing before the court must uphold the public interest and must clearly be seen to uphold the public interest, and I would share his concern if I thought that were not being done. I have no evidence to the contrary, despite what some of the tabloids have claimed.

**Mr Conway:** It's not just what the tabloids are telling us; it's what lawyers in the courtrooms of Ontario are reporting to us and I'm sure to other members. The minister of justice will know that section 85 offences are not the only firearm offences.

Let me say as a final point, and it's a question I'd like to ask the Premier, quite frankly, but I will ask it to him through you: This is a very serious concern and it is rising in importance every day. It's not just in Metropolitan Toronto. My colleague the member for Cornwall was reporting to me the other day about a murder in Alexandria where a firearm was involved that I believe belonged to an OPP officer.

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** RCMP.

**Mr Conway:** RCMP; I appreciate the correction. We've had those situations in Ottawa. We've had all of these other cases in Metropolitan Toronto and elsewhere. It is clear that people in this province are increasingly concerned about the safety they are feeling or not feeling in their communities, whether it is in the heart of Metropolitan Toronto or in rural eastern Ontario.

Will this government give this Legislature and all the people in this province this undertaking today: that it will bring forward within days a set of proposals and put those proposals for constructive action around a number of these issues, whether it's the gun exchange, whether it's the retailing of bullets, and a variety of other issues that we could, I think, develop ourselves, with the aid and support of people like the chiefs of police and community groups such as the one represented here today?

1410

Will you, Minister, undertake to bring to this Legislature, or at least its justice committee, within days, a set of proposals and a call for action that we can address on a priority basis and that we will not rise later this spring without a clear plan of action that we can all work to improve and to legislate so that people like Mrs de Villiers, her group—

**The Speaker:** Will the member conclude his question, please.

**Mr Conway:** —and the other 10 million people in this province will rest more comfortably in the knowledge that the legislators in this place get the message about the rising tide of public concern and the growing frustration about inaction?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** The member is aware, and I think my colleague the Solicitor General indicated our willingness certainly to look at the suggestion that has been made that the justice committee have a series of sessions to deal with this. The Solicitor General had promised to get back to the opposition around that suggestion.

I should tell the member that I too am very concerned about what appears to be a sense on people's part that there is no sense of urgency on the part of our government. There is a great deal of sense of urgency, and in fact many of the actions that we have been taking ever since we came into government have been focused on attempting to ensure that there is a greater confidence in the justice system because it works in a timely and effective and efficient manner.

We have tried to work with our federal colleagues to change some of the laws that we know are not working well and we have pledged ourselves to continue to do that, and it would be to our benefit to have a thorough discussion of other actions that we can take within our jurisdiction. I would assure the member that I certainly support his call for a really strong, in-depth look at this situation, whether it's through the justice committee or whether we find some other means that are mutually acceptable. I certainly would support that move.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** My question as well is to the Premier. This morning there was a press conference held here at Queen's Park at which Priscilla de Villiers, the president of Canadians Against Violence Everywhere Advocating its Termination, or CAVEAT, presented a report card on the performance of your government and the federal government with respect to the 137 recommendations contained in the coroners' inquest jury recommendations that looked into the deaths of Nina de Villiers and Jonathan Yeo.

I'd like to send over a copy of that report card for you, Premier. All members of this House express regrets that you've received a failing grade in this report card, because these matters are of serious concerns to Ontario citizens.

The main reason for your failing grade, Premier, as set out in the press conference this morning, was your lack of support for a victims' bill of rights. I want to indicate to you that a jury of Ontario citizens, communicating through an inquest report, has indicated to you that Ontario should have a victims' bill of rights.

Present in the House today is also Betty Brohman, the jury foreman, and several members of that inquest jury. Premier, I'm going to send you over a copy of Bill 19, An Act to establish the Rights of Victims of Crime.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jackson:** Yes, I can. Premier, you will recognize this document because it is a document known as Bill 113, which you supported on April 5, 1990, in this House, and the first Attorney General you appointed to this House supported this bill publicly.

In the report card, concern was expressed that—I quote directly from the report card—“These recommendations require decisions of such political magnitude that the success of their implementation depends on the support of Premier Bob Rae.”

My question to you is the question that Priscilla de Villiers raised at the press conference this morning when she wondered why it is, Premier, that before the last election, you spoke eloquently in support of victims' rights and an entrenched law in Ontario, but after you became Premier, you and your government abandoned this recommendation for a victims' bill of rights.

**The Speaker:** Will the member please place a question.

**Mr Jackson:** Will you please tell the jury foreman and Mrs de Villiers today why you've changed your mind?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'll refer that issue to the Attorney General.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** The Attorney General didn't change her mind; the Premier changed his mind.

**The Speaker:** Order. The Attorney General has the floor. The member for Etobicoke West is out of order.

**Mr Stockwell:** Just like yesterday. We didn't ask the Attorney General to change her mind; the Premier changed his mind.

**The Speaker:** The member for Etobicoke West continues to be out of order. I ask him to please come to order.

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** I think the member is very well aware that the members of this government are not in any way unsympathetic with the plight of victims of crime. Many of us on this side, myself included, have spent most of our lives working in fact as advocates for victims of crime and many of us have ourselves been victimized in various ways, so we feel very deeply the same kind of pain and the same kind of concern that has been expressed by the victims' advocate groups.

As government, we have had to consider what we can actually do to make the situation of victims more effective in the courts, to help victims to sense that there is a true balance between their interests and the interests of the accused and the interests of the general public, to try and work by changing the system, by changing the support services, by ensuring that victims have a say in the courts.

We now have in this province, for example, as of March 31, the requirement that victims' statements be available at sentencing, and that has been made uniform across the province. That's been a big demand of victims' groups and we're putting that into effect. We are continuing to do that work.

Given the shortness of time that we have in the Legislature, the weight of our legislative agenda, we have decided to put our time and our effort into those practical measures that are going to make the biggest difference to the victims of crime and not into the kind of discussion that the member wants about his private member's bill.

**Mr Jackson:** The citizens of Burlington, Ontario, gave the de Villiers family all the sympathy they needed. They did not want sympathy from this government; they want understanding from this government. They specifically addressed to the Premier of Ontario, Bob Rae, that they want more than sympathy, that in fact what they want from the Premier is for him not, as Mrs de Villiers said, to be politically hypocritical. They want that commitment from the Premier that he supports the reforms necessary, the reforms that exist in the province of Quebec, reforms that exist in provinces across Canada. Yet Ontario does not have a victims' bill of rights.

I remind you, Premier, that your Attorney General was here supporting a victims' bill of rights when she was employed with the London rape crisis centre. The fact is, the hypocrisy of your government is well known.

Premier, another recommendation contained in this report card, in fact a recommendation contained from the jury of Ontario peers, was that your government consider budget increases for law enforcement. We have brought forward positive suggestions in this House for ways to find moneys. I'm sending you over a copy of Bill 85, An Act to prevent unjust enrichment through the Proceeds of Crime, a bill that Debbie Mahaffy sponsors and wishes she could be in the House today to re-present to you.

Premier, we have been advised through your member for London South that it is your government's intention not to consider seriously this bill which takes profit from criminals and puts it into a criminal justice system. Today, Premier, we have a legal aid system which, according to Priscilla de Villiers, is being badly abused—

**The Speaker:** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jackson:** —with frivolous applications for lawsuits being paid by legal aid, when Clifford Olson can initiate, we're told, up to 47 lawsuits in this province.

Premier, I have to ask you on behalf of the citizens of Burlington, on behalf of CAVEAT and on behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus, will you not support the kinds of legislative initiatives like Bill 85 in order to ensure that proceeds of crime are directed directly at victims and victims' services and we get the balance back into our criminal justice system in this province. Will you do that as Premier?

1420

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** Our government has spoken in this House and in committee about the reason why this particular bill is not being supported. There are a number of very valid reasons that the member is well aware of.

We are also concerned about ensuring that there are ways in which we can ensure that the victims' services are being supported. The Treasurer announced in his budget last year, and we intend to proceed with, a victim fine surcharge for provincial offences which will do



exactly what the member suggests.

There are other ways in which there can be some control done in individual cases on proceeds from crime. But the member is well aware that what a jurisdiction, a small jurisdiction like ours, relatively speaking, can do in terms of the proceeds of crime when we have a giant to the south and several other provinces surrounding us makes it impossible for us to ensure that things will not be published in other jurisdictions. It's very, very difficult to prevent the kind of profit that the member wants. We have explained this again and again to him, and this is another effort for him to debate his bill in this House.

**Mr Jackson:** Premier, your Attorney General does not only give bad answers; she's badly informed. The two largest media giants in the United States, New York state and California state, both have this legislation. Premier, it was a member of your own caucus who modelled the very first draft of the proceeds of crime.

I remind you, Premier, that what was said this morning by CAVEAT and by others is that there's an incredible amount of political hypocrisy of the worst order from you and your government, that what you said before you were government and what you said after—

**The Speaker:** The honourable member knows better. I would ask him to withdraw the unparliamentary remark and place his very important question.

**Mr Jackson:** I will withdraw the unparliamentary remark.

Premier, three serious coroners' juries have reported in this province dealing with serious cases of sexual psychopaths. Each one of those coroners' inquests, the Dennis Kerr inquest, the Jonathan Yeo inquest and the Joseph Fredericks inquest, all had some common themes in them. They called out to your government to propose and help make changes to our Criminal Code and to our Mental Health Act.

The Coroners Act inquest report also indicated that there should be follow-up and accountability, the timely reporting of each of the ministries.

Premier, Anna Stephenson is in the House today. She has expressed to you and to the public her concern that amendments to the Coroners Act be brought in.

I'd like to send over a copy of Bill 148, amendments to the Coroners Act. I would ask, Premier, that you examine these recommendations, which have been contained from citizens of Ontario reporting an inquest, that you would have the political will or, as CAVEAT has indicated—

**The Speaker:** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jackson:** —that these decisions and support from the Premier are of such a political magnitude that the success depends on the implementation and the support of Premier Bob Rae. Will your government implement these bills to support victims of crime in the province of Ontario, yes or no?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** First of all, it is difficult for any of us, no matter who happens to get the question in the first place, to answer questions that are in a number of different responsibilities. Of course the Coroners Act is

under the responsibility of the Solicitor General. My understanding is that the Solicitor General has on a number of occasions indicated his concern and his interest in the kinds of suggestions that have been made with respect to amendments to the Coroners Act.

Again, I would say to the member and to the House that all of these issues that have been raised we consider very seriously. We are prepared indeed to consider changes, as the legislative agenda allows. We are certainly not saying that we will not consider these, but we are saying that there are a series of priorities that we have set. There are many changes we have already put into place that very much have been the centre of demands by victims' groups over a number of years. We will continue, as we can, to implement appropriate changes.

But no, we are not going to say to the member today that his particular private member's bills are going to become the agenda of this government. We are saying to him that we are grateful for the occasion of the discussion that his bills have given us, that they have added to the collective information we all have and that they certainly have been an important aspect of the work we have done in terms of improving the response of the criminal justice system.

**The Speaker:** New question, the leader of the third party.

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** I want the Attorney General to know that the private members' bills are the bills of the people. They're the bills of the coroners' juries. They're not the private members' bills; they're not the members' exclusively. They're the bills of the people that you are rejecting.

#### LABOUR DISPUTE

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** Since we are getting nowhere in that direction today, I have a question of the Premier. In the absence of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation, my question, Premier, deals with the situation at the Ontario Science Centre.

Over a month ago 32 cleaners whose company is contracted by the Ontario Science Centre went out on strike. The Ontario Science Centre costs Ontario taxpayers over \$20 million a year to operate. Over 900,000 tourists visit the centre each year.

Even though I know your government doesn't treat tourism seriously, I would ask you if you can report to this House on how this strike has affected one of Ontario's most important and publicly funded tourist attractions.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'd refer this to the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation.

**Hon Anne Swarbrick (Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation):** I think if the Leader of the Opposition were to speak to the tourism industry, the tourism industry would confirm to him that in fact this government treats tourism more seriously than any other past government has.

#### Interjection.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for York Centre. Minister.

**Hon Ms Swarbrick:** There's no doubt that the strike at the science centre presents a difficulty to the science centre, to the staff, to be able to continue to operate, but continue to operate they are and service is continuing to be provided. Tourists and students are continuing to be able to visit the science centre to receive the education and the tremendous benefit the science centre provides to the people of this province.

**Mr Harris:** Earlier today my staff went to the science centre and, Minister, they brought back these pictures of what they saw at the science centre. These are the pictures, which I will make available to you and to others who are interested.

To quote my staff: "The science centre is a complete mess, all right, and it even smells bad. It is becoming a garbage dump. Two managers of the cleaning company are trying to do the job of 32." Why? Because your government's labour legislation prevents other employees from cleaning up the garbage. Even though the science centre doesn't directly employ the striking workers, it is suffering.

In regard to this great advocate for tourism that virtually 99% of the tourist operators tell me has been an absolute, in conjunction with the cabinet and the government, disgrace to the tourism industry, let me ask you this: Do you think it's fair that not only Ontario taxpayers are suffering, but tourism is suffering because their science centre is becoming a garbage dump because of Bill 40, your government's labour legislation? Do you think that's fair?

**Hon Ms Swarbrick:** I am tremendously proud of the fact that this government presented labour legislation that makes the rights of both employers and employees fair in this province. What we have passed is tremendously fair labour legislation for all of the people of this province.

The science centre is not the employer in this situation, but I do appreciate, having been there myself and having seen the problems, that there is a problem. As a consequence, I spoke to the Minister of Labour earlier this week and asked him to appoint a mediator to come to terms with assisting the parties to try to remedy this dispute. The mediator is imminently to be appointed. I'm very hopeful, as I assume the leader of the opposition will be, that the mediator will have the kind of success that this government hopes it will have in settling this dispute.

1430

**Mr Harris:** Is the mediator going to clean up the garbage? Nobody wants to take their kids to visit a garbage dump. The other staff of the facility, who take pride in their facility, would like to clean it up but have been told they can't because your government's legislation says it's illegal in Ontario to clean up garbage in your own work site. The company can't bring in its own replacement workers because your legislation says that's illegal in Ontario.

If this strike continues for much longer, as is very likely the case, the centre will lose its attractiveness to tourists. Minister, if somehow or other we can't find a way, through replacement workers, through existing staff

or through volunteers, which your legislation says they cannot do, if we cannot somehow get through this, we are going to find that we may never be able to replace those tourists who want to go to the science centre.

I would ask you this on behalf of the tourism industry: Will you ask your Premier and your cabinet to take another look at the destructive, job-destroying nature of Bill 40?

**Hon Ms Swarbrick:** The employees of the science centre, I know, want this government to respect, as they'd like the opposition to respect, the rights of their brothers and sisters in the OPSEU local who are on strike at the science centre.

I would urge the leader of the third party to join with me in encouraging the company and the union involved to accede to the invitation of the mediator to sit down to very seriously work on settling this dispute in the interests of all Ontarians.

ROBIN SEARS

**Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights):** I have a question to the Premier. Mr Premier, on November 18 there was an exchange that took place between your Minister of Economic Development and Trade and the member for Renfrew North. It was a lengthy and animated exchange and I just want to quote a very small part of it. The member for Renfrew North said:

"I want to ask the minister, why was it that when we called your trade office, your department, this morning to ask what we might do about pursuing some trade questions in the south Pacific and in southeast Asia, we were told not to bother or even try to contact your quarter of a million dollars a year man, Mr Robin Sears in Tokyo, but were told to contact a bureaucrat here at Queen's Park? What is Mr Robin Sears doing to earn this quarter of a million dollars' worth of public expenditure at a time when we are so broke and so strained for resources?"

The minister went on to respond, and again I'm just going to quote a small part, "We have informed the agent general that this contract will be terminated in March 1994," and later on in the exchange she said: "The member has asked, will we end this practice? I will tell him that I will end it on March 31, 1994, when the contract expires...."

My question, Mr Premier, is this: Has the contract with Mr Sears been terminated, and is he now not employed by the province of Ontario?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I ordinarily, of course, would refer that question to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, but she's not here. She has full responsibility for that issue. But I would say to the honourable member that my understanding is that Mr Sears's service, his contract, is coming to an end.

**Mr Kwinter:** I want to take the Premier at his word. He just said "is coming to an end," when in fact the undertaking given by the minister was that on March 31, 1994, that contract would be terminated.

The information I have, Mr Premier, is that in fact his contract has been extended for a period of about three months to help you with your upcoming trip to China. That is the information that I have. I have also been told



that he has really no responsibilities and that the deputy minister is making those arrangements.

I would ask the Premier, seeing as how he doesn't seem to know, to check into that, because the information that I have is usually quite reliable.

**Hon Mr Rae:** I would say to the honourable member that I will take his question as notice, and that's all I can tell him.

#### MASSEY CENTRE FOR WOMEN

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** My question is to the Minister of Housing. My question is about the Massey Centre for Women in East York, which I'm proud to say has an internationally recognized transitional housing program for pre-natal and post-natal young women. My question is about Bill 120.

Minister, you will know that today the Massey Centre has an exemption from the Landlord and Tenant Act, but under Bill 120, that exemption will be lost. I'm particularly referring to phase 3 of their program, in which the young mothers, with an average age of about 17, stay for about two years and they learn to parent and they complete their schooling and they get control of their lives. This program is a second chance for them, Minister, and the issue is security.

Under Bill 120, the centre will be unable to impose restrictions on violent or threatening male visitors. Without that security, the centre will lose its mandate, the centre could possibly lose private funding, and the whole program will be in jeopardy.

Minister, I am asking you today, the Massey Centre has asked you, and perhaps more to the point the young mothers at the Massey Centre have asked you, will you continue the exemption for this centre for transitional housing from the Landlord and Tenant Act?

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** I thank the member for the question. He may have been aware that I answered a similar question in response to a question from the member for Scarborough East earlier in the Legislature.

He will know, as he's familiar with the Massey Centre, that it is a centre in which three programs operate. The pre-natal program obviously is unaffected by Bill 120. The program that operates immediately following the birth of the child is an average length of stay of less than six months, and it will be exempt from coverage by the Landlord and Tenant Act.

The third part of the program, which is physically separate within the centre, is the second-stage housing portion, which is a monitored program. Under the legislation, if the average length of stay, the program length, is less than two years, then there would be an exemption. If the Massey Centre establishes that, then there will be an exemption in the sense that women who are staying there will be asked to leave and free up positions at the two-year point.

The question he asked specifically is the application of the Landlord and Tenant Act to visitors of a violent and threatening nature. Any landlord and any tenant has the right to ask any visitor who is violent or of a threatening nature to remove himself from the property.

**Mr David Johnson:** That's just great. Here we have 17-year-old mothers who are running from pimps, who are running from drug dealers, who are running from abusive partners. Now what you're saying is that under the threat of this violence from these male visitors, you're expecting them to contact the police, when they know full well that with those male visitors being there, there will be reprisals. They're not going to do that. The mothers are telling you that, with the kind of lifestyle they've had, they are not going to be able to do that. The kind of exemption you're talking about will not help these people.

1440

The administrators of the Massey Centre are saying it isn't going to work. This is an internationally recognized program. It's an excellent program. If you're really interested in the vulnerable people, if the purpose of this bill is to protect the vulnerable, these are among the most vulnerable in our society. Will you not look at this again? We're all pleading with you: Take another look at this. You're putting this program in jeopardy. Please say you'll take another look at this program and look at an exemption for transitional housing at the Massey Centre.

**Hon Ms Gigantes:** I've not only taken a look at the program, I've visited the centre, so I'm very familiar with its operations and I'm also familiar with the concerns that have been raised. But I think the member has to understand that under the Landlord and Tenant Act, either the tenant or the operator, which is in this case the landlord, has a perfect right to call the police and ask for the removal of any person who is visiting the property who is there as a threat or who is threatening violent behaviour. That is what should be happening now and I'm sure it is happening, and that's what will happen, I'm sure, once the operator becomes familiar with what will be the standard situation under the Landlord and Tenant Act.

It is the case that many operators are not familiar yet with how the Landlord and Tenant Act protects both landlords and tenants from precisely this kind of intrusion onto property.

#### MOTORCYCLES

**Mr Ron Hansen (Lincoln):** My question is for the minister responsible for automobile insurance in Ontario. I've received a number of calls from motorcyclists who claim that, because of Bill 164, they will not be able to get motorcycle insurance for the coming year. I've had two dealers call me also and they're asking me what they are going to do with the bikes that are in their showrooms if the riders can't get motorcycle insurance, because the customers of these motorcycle dealers are going to be suffering.

Can the minister inform me and my constituents and the motorcycle riders in Ontario if Bill 164 has created a crisis situation with respect to motorcycle insurance coverage?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** I thank the member for his question this afternoon. I should say at the outset that first of all, Bill 164 has not created a crisis in terms of motorcycle insurance. The member will recall a fairly major demon-

stration by the motorcyclists' rights association in front of the Legislature two years ago under the Ontario motorist protection plan. This is a situation that has been evolving for some time, but there is no crisis in the system.

We have a very specific problem which has emerged this year. One of the major insurers—and there are very few insurers in the province who cover motorcycles—which has delivered insurance for motorcycles is refusing to sell insurance policies on a particular class of bikes, a class of very powerful supersport bikes. We are working with the industry to try and sort this out. The government's responsibility is to ensure that there is accessibility for insurance for those people who want to drive motor vehicles of any kind on the roads in this province, and at the end of the day we will ensure that accessibility.

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** I have a letter from the Motorcycle and Moped Industry Council expressing its concerns about the loss of jobs in the showrooms because of the fact that a lot of people can't get the motorcycle insurance, and this is at the time when most people are starting to get their motorcycles out.

Also what we're asking is, is there going to be a backlash, say, in the fall when a lot of people are getting their motorcycles out and they're having difficulty getting their insurance? I understand the motorcycle rates have gone up substantially, and with snowmobiles the rates have gone up, in some cases up to 100%. I know every time they phone in and ask, it's always the insurance company saying it's because of what this government's done in Bill 164. So is there a backlash from Bill 164 that's causing this problem?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Again, I thank the member for his question because—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order. The member for Markham, please come to order. Minister.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** Again, I thank the member for Kitchener-Wilmot for his question because it is an important question and it deals with some things that are being said out there in the public.

What's happening with motorcycles and what's happening with snowmobiles has little or nothing to do with Bill 164. The impact of Bill 164 on motorcycle and snowmobile insurance is to the extent of about 5%, the same as it is on auto insurance. In the case of both motorcycle coverage and snowmobile coverage, there is not a company in this province—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** —that has had an increase since 1988, and as a result—

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** It's already 12.5% from OMPP—over 17% already.

**The Speaker:** The member for Willowdale.

**Hon Mr Charlton:** —the companies that have neglected to keep their rates up to date are now adding in a six-year increase all in one shot.

#### YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** In the absence of the Premier, my question will be to the Chairman of Management Board. It has to do with what I regard as a crisis, and that is the whole situation around jobs for our young people.

The minister will know that four years ago perhaps one in 10 of our young people couldn't find a job. Now, as you look at the numbers—and I believe this to be the case as you look at all of the statistics—I think it's fair to say that one out of every three of our young people from the age of 15 to 24—

**Hon Evelyn Gigantes (Minister of Housing):** One in five.

**Mr Phillips:** The Minister of Housing is shaking her head, but those are the facts and we have a crisis on our hands. The fact is that it's one out of three, and you should begin to look at the numbers, because if you think it's one out of five, that's part of the problem.

My question to the minister is this: Last year in your budget you said that things would be getting better. You said to the young people of this province, "Don't worry; job prospects are picking up."

Job prospects haven't, and we see in the latest statistics that any reasonable person would suggest that one out of three cannot find a job now. Can you tell us what happened? What went wrong in your budget? Why did it not work?

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet):** I thank the member for his question, because he's focusing on an important issue. Although the overall unemployment situation is an important one for all of us to consider, there are two critical aspects to the whole unemployment question in this province. He's identified the one, and unfortunately the opposition very rarely ever focuses on the other.

He's focused on the question of young people who are for the most part out looking for their first job, or who got a first job and lost it very quickly. There's also the problem in this province of the older workers who, because of the industrial collapse over the course of the last five years, find themselves in very difficult midlife situations. The training programs which this government has targeted have moved us a significant way along the road to providing direct assistance to both of those groups.

The member specifically asked what failed in the budget. I would suggest to the member opposite that nothing failed in the budget. He knows, and he knows full well, that governments do not create all of the jobs that economies require. The situation that we face is a situation that is true right across this continent and in every province across this country in terms of the slow rate of the recovery. The kind of initiatives that we've taken to focus on assisting individuals is, we think, the appropriate focus, and we will continue that focus in our efforts around job creation.

**Mr Phillips:** I'll try not to get too angry with the member, but I really think that to suggest that this is not a crisis, you don't understand the problem. We have



among all of Ontario's crises—as a matter of fact, I share with you the concern about older workers. In Ontario in the first three months of 1994, we have a tragedy: We have lost 4,000 jobs in the province. The rest of the country has gained 150,000 jobs. If you don't understand the problem, you'll never solve it.

I'm specifically focusing on young people today because they have been particularly hard hit. The statistics are there for you to look at. One out of three can't find a job, and if you don't understand that, Minister, then we'll never solve the problem.

1450

In the first quarter of 1994, January, February and March, once again we saw roughly 50,000 jobs among our young people gone. We saw roughly 50,000 of our young people drop right out of the labour market.

Would you now agree that this is a crisis, and would you agree with us to bring forward to the Legislature a plan of how you're going to deal with what can only be described by any reasonable person as a crisis? Will you undertake to bring forward a plan for dealing with the crisis of unemployment among young people in this province?

**Hon Mr Charlton:** The member opposite stands up and requests a plan. I would suggest to the member opposite that he also asked in his first question how our budget had failed. I suggested in my response that it hasn't.

First of all, I didn't say that there is no crisis for young people. I suggested that there was, and as well, a crisis for many older workers who have been impacted by the economic collapse in the industrial sector in this province.

The programs which this government has proceeded with have targeted for the most part around infrastructure development and training, and most of the training initiatives have been taken with the young people in this province, the very people he's talking about who are having difficulties out there in the work market, and yet his own party stands up day after day and says to cancel Jobs Ontario Training and get rid of the 40,000 places we've created where those people are getting training and getting paid to be trained for those positions.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The time for oral questions has expired.

#### QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: With the length of question period today, I'm wondering if you would review Hansard to try to get question period down to an appropriate time, so that members who are sitting here waiting for important questions on behalf of their constituents can stand front and centre in this House and present the questions to the minister.

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** On the point of order, Mr Speaker: To assist the member for Chatham-Kent, I would ask permission of the House, unanimous consent, for us to carry on with question period so his important question can be asked.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** On the same

point of order, the member for Willowdale.

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** I thought you wanted me to ask the next question, Mr Speaker. I'm prepared to ask it.

**The Speaker:** I realize there is a great deal of eagerness to ask questions. The honourable member for Bruce indeed has a point of order. We require unanimous consent to continue with question period. Is there unanimous consent?

I heard at least one negative voice.

**Mr Elston:** Could I just follow up on the point of order?

**The Speaker:** The one that was raised?

**Mr Elston:** Yes.

I would like it to be noted that while the member for Chatham-Kent asked that his question be put, he indicated that he would not consent to the extension of the question period. It seems to me he can't have it both ways. Either he wants his question asked or he shouldn't complain about what's going on in here.

**The Speaker:** To the member for Chatham-Kent, you have an additional—how about if I deal with your point of order first? If you have an additional one, I'm more than pleased to listen to it.

The member for Chatham-Kent raises a very important concern, and while I realize that there were extremely important and urgent questions which were brought to the House today, at the same time, I continue to urge members to make their questions brief, and to have responses brief as well.

When the leadoff questions are lengthy, backbench members of all three parties are often denied an opportunity to place their questions, and today, of course, was not a good example of how backbench members have an opportunity to place their questions. All I can do is to continue to urge members on both sides of the House to cooperate and try to keep their questions short and the replies short.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: This has nothing to do with the previous point of order; this has more to do with the fact of ministers of the crown referring questions, and I ask you to investigate.

In the past two days we've had two occasions where the Premier in one case and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology in fact referred questions put to them by members of the opposition, specifically the third party.

It says very clearly in the standing orders, on page 26, rule 33(f): "A minister to whom an oral question is directed may refer the question to another minister who is responsible for the subject matter to which the question relates,"

Mr Speaker, I think you have an obligation to ensure that you hear the questions and ensure that when the referral is taking place the subject matter clearly is not in the hands of the person who has requested a question to you. I might add—

**The Speaker:** Would the member take his seat please.

**Mr Stockwell:** Will you let me finish?

**The Speaker:** No. Would the member please take his seat. He may not have been here or realized that the honourable member for London North raised a point of order on this very matter yesterday. I undertook to review it and to report back to the House. There is nothing out of order about referring questions. I will deal with the point of order that was raised by the member for London North. This is the same point.

**Mr Stockwell:** Mr Speaker, with all due respect, it is the same point and the same issue and I would like to record a clear indication of where it happened again, once again today. Now the question is put to the—

**The Speaker:** I have dealt with the matter. Would the member please take his seat.

#### PETITIONS

##### VIOLENCE

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I have 13 petitions signed by 129 residents of Braeside and Arnprior:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;

"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to admire or emulate, but rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

I support this petition, which added to the others I have read over the last week and a half comes to 1,901 signatures, and I have affixed my signature.

##### COLLINGWOOD GENERAL AND MARINE HOSPITAL

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas continued government funding cutbacks will force the Collingwood General and Marine Hospital to close eight more hospital beds, and these cutbacks are having a continued negative impact on employment in the Collingwood area;

"Whereas the government is failing to adhere to their own 'Principles of Restructuring' which states that restructuring of the hospital sector must be linked to equitable funding, appropriate and accessible community-based health services, and that restructuring initiatives must address the impact of these changes on hospital staff and the local economy and the health care needs of the community;

"Whereas the government refuses to give the green light to redevelop the General and Marine Hospital, even though the provincial government announced funding for the project in 1987, and even though the General and Marine cannot achieve additional operating efficiencies unless the hospital is redeveloped;

"Therefore, we demand that the provincial government immediately approve the redevelopment of the Collingwood General and Marine Hospital and that the hospital be given some financial breathing space to assess the impact of these bed closures on the labour and health care needs of the Collingwood community."

I have signed this petition and would like the Legislature to know that a total of 6,900-and-some-odd people, very good people from Collingwood and area, have also signed this petition.

##### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** I have a petition here that was sent to me by R.G. Morgan, executive vice-president of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. It is a petition, and we have had several read into the House, regarding their concern about the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination for those who've already taken it.

The petition has over 50 names on it, most of them from the riding of Oxford. About half of them are members of the federation and half are not. I submit that petition now.

##### VIOLENCE

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;

"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to admire or emulate, but rather, contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

This is signed by a large number of people, and I'm prepared to affix my signature to this in agreement with it.

1500

##### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I have a petition of 65 signatures from the village of Grand Valley in my riding of Dufferin-Peel, and it's addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:



"Whereas traditional family values that recognize marriage as a union between a man and a woman are under attack by Liberal MPP Tim Murphy and his private member's Bill 45; and

"Whereas this bill would recognize same-sex couples and extend to them all the same rights as heterosexual couples; and

"Whereas the bill was carried with the support of an NDP and Liberal majority but with no PC support in the second reading debate on June 24, 1993; and

"Whereas this bill is currently with the legislative committee on the administration of justice and is being readied for quick passage in the Legislature; and

"Whereas this bill has not been fully examined for financial and societal implications;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to stop this bill and future bills which would grant same-sex couples the right to marry, and to consider its impact on families of Ontario."

I have signed this petition.

**Hon Bud Wildman (Minister of Environment and Energy and Minister Responsible for Native Affairs):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I recognize the importance of members representing their constituents' concerns in petitions to the crown. I respect that, but I was wondering if the member gave the candidate, Ms Jackman, in the by-election, the opportunity to sign that petition.

#### VIOLENCE

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** I have a petition signed by at least a couple of hundred people in my area. It's in relation to the serial killer trading cards. It basically sets out the very same information that we've heard from others and it resolves as follows:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure the ban of these killer trading cards in the province of Ontario and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who violate the ban and sell these killer trading cards."

It is signed by people like Martina Cronin and Dolores Shuett in Mildmay, and Gladys Dietrich from Mildmay as well, as well as hundreds of people out of the Walkerton-Cargill area in my constituency, and I have affixed my signature to it as well.

#### TOBACCO PACKAGING

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the proposed amendment of Bill 119 mandating the plain packaging of cigarettes will directly cause the loss of 400 to 500 jobs in Lanark, Leeds, Grenville counties, and therefore ask that the amendment be deleted."

This was signed by 700 residents of the Prescott area, and these names I gather were gathered over a period of four days. I am affixing my signature in support.

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Ms Haeck from the standing committee on regulations and private bills presented the committee's report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendments:

Bill Pr83, An Act respecting the City of Burlington

Your committee begs to report that the following bill be not reported:

Bill Pr46, An Act respecting the City of Mississauga

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### COUNTY OF ESSEX ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Hayes, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr103, An Act respecting the County of Essex.

#### COUNTY OF ESSEX

#### LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1994

On motion by Mr Hayes, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill Pr108, An Act respecting the County of Essex and the Local Municipalities in it.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

#### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA TAXE DE VENTE AU DÉTAIL

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 138, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act / Projet de loi 138, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la taxe de vente au détail.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin):** I believe when we ended the debate the last time Mr Cousens had the floor. We had already asked two questions, so we have two more questions and then your comments, Mr Cousens.

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** I'm pleased to respond to the member for Markham, who went on quite at length to talk about all the evils of the bill and the evils of everything else, I guess, in terms of what the government has been doing and how his government would be coming in and managing things very effectively.

Of course, throughout this debate one of the areas he had to bring up was the Workers' Compensation Board.

If we go and look at the history of the Workers' Compensation Board, it was established by a Conservative government, but when you want to talk about lack of management, and mismanagement, then I think we should go back and look at the Tory record.

The unfunded liability for the Workers' Compensation Board in 1980 was only \$365 million. What was the unfunded liability around 1985 when they lost power? About \$6 billion. Do you call that good management?

What about Ontario Hydro? What about its large debt that was accumulated through these so-called 42 wonder-

ful years of Tory management in the province of Ontario? What about that?

Then of course I must say too that unfortunately the previous government didn't deal with those situations. Those bills are coming due. This government is providing leadership. It has a plan. It's going to implement that plan. It is dealing with it, making the tough decisions regarding Ontario Hydro. It's going to make the tough decisions that are necessary at the Workers' Compensation Board.

When members like the member for Markham get up and want to talk to us about how wonderful their management was for 42 years, I just automatically think of the Workers' Compensation Board and how the unfunded liability just grew out of control under Progressive Conservative leadership, or should I say lack of leadership and lack of management, because they didn't do anything about it? They didn't take the corrective actions so that we wouldn't have the problems we have today.

In this day and era governments have to make tough decisions. We're making those tough decisions. This bill is part of that plan.

**Mr Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville):** I want to take this opportunity in respect to questions and comments related to the intervention, the submission, by the Conservative Finance critic, Mr Cousens from Markham, to compliment him on the submission he made in respect to our concerns generally, not only about Bill 138 but the taxation policies of the NDP provincial government and its predecessor government, the Liberal government of Ontario.

We know that over the last almost 10 years now—I describe it as a decade of decline, the Liberal and NDP legacy in Ontario—we have gone from a province that held its head high, felt proud about its place in Confederation, and now we see almost 20% of Ontarians out of work who can't find jobs, over one million people on social assistance, over 500,000 people on the unemployment rolls. That's why my colleague the outstanding member for Markham, Mr Donald Cousens, has been standing up in this House day after day, week after week, month after month, fighting on behalf of beleaguered taxpayers in this province, people who are faced with very difficult circumstances in terms of trying to find a job, trying to look after their families, trying to simply meet their everyday needs.

1510

It's become an impossible situation for so many people in this province, given the standing we had not only in Canada but in the world as a place to look to towards investment, towards development, towards job creation, a place that people wanted to come to from all parts of this world. Now that image has been completely turned around over the short period of nine and a half years of Liberal and NDP rule in this province. I can only compliment the member for Markham, Mr Cousens, for his efforts on behalf of not only Ontario, but all of the people of this great country of ours.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Markham, you have two minutes to reply.

**Mr W. Donald Cousens (Markham):** I sincerely thank the member for Leeds-Grenville and the member for Don Mills for their comments. I don't want to thank the New Democrats for the comments I got from them, what they had to say on my speech.

The point is that since the New Democrats came to power, they taxed us a billion dollars more in the first year, another billion in the second year, and two billion last year, and this Bill 138 is just a further aggravation pushing the Ontario taxpayer to the wall. They're taking the money away from people, removing the incentive to work. They are forcing the underground economy into a blossoming trade. They're forcing people to go illegal. They have all kinds of dumb excuses for what they're doing, none of them satisfactory.

When the one member starts talking about the Workers' Compensation Board, I'll tell you, it's run by a bunch of political hacks appointed by the government instead of having professionals in there to run the business. Yes, the unfunded liability has doubled, by another \$6 billion, since we lost power in 1985. It's still wrong, and this government doesn't know how to correct anything.

What we're seeing the government do is drain off the lifeblood of the people of Ontario by increasing taxes: taxes on insurance, taxes on parking. They won't stop with taxes until they've taken every corner and rounded everything so that we have nothing left and the government has all the money.

Our concern about Bill 138 still stands. We will not allow increases in taxes. We must freeze taxes in the province of Ontario. That's the commitment Mike Harris has. That's the commitment of our caucus.

We in Ontario have seen 33 tax increases from the Liberals. We saw them come in with their tire tax. At least the one thing that's happened in this bill is we're removing the tire tax of \$5 a tire.

I would hope this government would find other ways of removing other taxes. We removed the tobacco tax; let's remove some of the other taxes so the people of Ontario will once again have some of their own money to spend, rather than you guys—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member's time has expired. Any further debate?

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Ottawa South):** I'm looking forward to participating in this debate and lending a particular focus to it which I think warrants our attention; that is, the impact of the new taxes on the you-brews or brew-on-premises operations in this province.

Bill 138, just to be specific, talks about a new tax, part of which already kicked in last August. It says now that people who go in and make use of these operations to make their own beer or wine are now going to be paying, or they started last August 1 to pay, 26 cents a litre on the beer or wine they're making there. That tax is going to increase on June 14 of this year to 31 cents, and then on June 14 of next year, 1995, it will increase to 38 cents per litre of beer or wine.

Just in case there's any misconception here, those consumers, those people who are going in and using their



own labour to make beer or wine, are already paying a tax on the ingredients which go into making that beer or wine and they're also paying a tax, the GST, on the service component offered by the people who run those operations.

I think the means by which the government went about studying this problem, the implementation of the tax, and the outcome, which I hope to describe properly here today, will be a good case study in how to screw up a good thing.

I want to start off by painting the picture of the brew-on-premises industry in this province. That was a fairly novel concept. It's only been around here for some four or five years now, I guess, starting in 1990, and it's grown to, at its peak, some 235 outlets. Those are operations owned by small business entrepreneurs in this province who sank, collectively, about \$50 million into their businesses, averaging, as I understand, about \$200,000 per operation. Those were small business entrepreneurs. There are a few chains, but they're more the exception than the rule. Those people mortgaged their homes and some of them gave up their jobs—well, most of them gave up their jobs when they got into it on a full-time basis—mortgaged themselves up to the hilt, in short, to get their businesses going and to pay for those capital costs.

The other good news about that small business industry is that it employed over 2,000 people in the province.

So it was really small business at its best. The remarkable thing, of course, is that this business grew, these small businesses mushroomed throughout the province to a point where they were up to 235, during the depths of a particularly deep recession.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe there's a quorum present.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Would you please verify whether there is a quorum.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Ottawa South, you may continue the debate.

**Mr McGuinty:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I'm glad to see I've drawn a greater audience.

I was describing small business at its best, the you-brew industries in the province, and how remarkable it was that they had grown during the course of a terrible recession. Of course those businesses were clean operations. They didn't pollute. They paid out all kinds of money: They paid their rent, they paid property taxes, they paid insurance—fire insurance, liability insurance—they paid to heat their premises, they paid hydro charges, they paid water charges, they paid interest on their startup loans, they paid interest on their lines of credit. They paid employment taxes, paid UI, WCB, CPP and employer health tax. They paid salaries. They were putting money back into the community and were feeding their families.

The businesses, as I say, were a success. The owners weren't getting particularly wealthy, but the businesses were growing. The success of the business was due to the fact that these beer and wine you-brews, or brew-on-premises, they're called, were offering an attractive product, were offering homemade beer or wine, plus more: You'd get the opportunity to learn how it's made, and there was an element of fun associated with this activity. You get out of the house, you go down to the store and you buy the ingredients. You get some professional assistance in terms of how to mix them and how to store them.

The other attractive element was that this operation is virtually foolproof. You end up with a good product at the end of the day and it was less expensive than going to the Beer Store and plunking down your money to get this beer and wine that's already ready-made.

Another important aspect of this, and one not to be overlooked, is that it was seen by many consumers of beer and wine in this province as kind of the last legitimate refuge from the greedy hands of the taxman, especially in a recession. The other avenue, of course, to get your beer or wine if you're feeling, as many of us do, that these products are overtaxed is through the black market. This was the last, as I say, legitimate refuge from the hands of the taxman.

1520

It's also important to understand the difference between buying—and I think the Finance minister has missed this; I've detected that in response to my questions that I've raised in this House with him. What is the difference between buying beer at the Beer Store or buying your wine at the LCBO, and making and buying your beer or wine through your brew-on-premises or your you-brew? If you buy it at the Beer Store, you pay cash. It's as simple as that; it's clean and it's simple. If you buy it at the you-brew, there are two components to the consideration, if you will: number one, you pay cash, and of course you pay less; second, there's a component or an element of time. When you go down to the you-brew or the brew-on-premises, you're putting in both time and cash, and you have to understand that equation. It's not simply a matter of comparing what is the cost at the you-brew and what is the cost at the Beer Store, or what is the cost at the LCBO and what is the cost at the you-brew.

As I mentioned earlier, people going down to these you-brews were already, before this new tax kicked in, paying taxes. They were paying their 8% provincial sales tax on the ingredients they bought and they were also paying their 7% GST on the service component that was offered by the people who run and work at these you-brews. It's important to understand that there comes a point in time when it's cheaper to go to the Beer Store when you consider that, when you're going to the you-brew, you're putting in both cash and your time. I don't believe the minister properly took that into consideration when he decided to implement this new tax.

Anyway, on June 22 in this House, I asked the minister about his budget, and particularly about this new tax which was going to kick in in August of last year. On

June 22, I raised the question with him about what kind of study he had done to determine the impact this would have on this fledgling, vulnerable small business industry in Ontario. His answer, the long and the short of it, was that there was no study done. The industry of course was very concerned about the impact of the tax, and I asked that the minister consider a moratorium for at least one year in order to prepare a responsible taxation policy.

I should say that these small business entrepreneurs have, by and large, not been demanding that they not be subject to any tax whatsoever; they're simply asking for a responsible level of taxation, one that doesn't drive them out of business.

In any event, the minister said no, he would not consent to any kind of a moratorium. So on August 1 of last year, this new 26-cents-per-litre tax kicked in.

On September 30, the month after the tax was put into place, I told the minister about the Brew on Premises Association of Eastern Ontario and some of the figures it had brought forward to me. They number 23 stores in eastern Ontario, and their average number of daily batches had been, prior to the implementation of the tax, 16. After the tax was brought in, it dropped to four. That was a 75% decline in business. They told me they needed 12 batches of beer a day to break even and they were down to less than seven. Each of the 23 stores in the eastern Ontario brew-on-premises association had laid off employees. The long and the short of it was that the tax was obviously having a terrible effect on this business, one of the few businesses in this province that was growing during the course of the recession.

I asked the minister on September 30 if he might rescind the tax, and his answer was no. He said, "This is not an onerous tax."

Starting in October of last year, I began—others did as well—to introduce petitions in this House signed by customers who frequented the brew-on-premise operations throughout this province. In fact, over 10,000 people ended up signing those, and I've even got a petition here today I wasn't able to file earlier. These people were expressing their concern about the additional costs associated with making a batch of beer or wine at a brew-on-premises operation, again keeping in mind that these people are already paying a provincial sales tax on the ingredients they buy there and paying GST on the service component.

In November 1993, the Brew on Premises Association of Ontario, a larger association which includes Metropolitan Toronto here, released the results of its survey. It appeared to be done a bit more scientifically than that of the people from eastern Ontario. The minister may have had some concerns about the scientific accuracy of that study, but there are none, certainly, about this one.

This study as well assessed the impact of this new 26-cents-per-litre tax. That association has 164 members. The results of that survey were as follows: 186 full-time jobs were lost since the tax kicked in; 225 part-time jobs were lost since the tax began; sales volumes were down by 50%. Remember, the only difference between the before and after here was that we have a new tax of 26 cents a litre on the product. These folks tell me that they

need 10 batches of beer a day to break even, and they were down to only making six batches a day.

They also reported that of their 164 members, there were 10 bankruptcies, 33 of the members had gone into receivership, 45 operators had lost their credit status and were no longer able to borrow money to keep operating their businesses.

I spoke with the secretary of the Brew on Premises Association of Ontario just yesterday, and he told me that in fact things are even worse now than they were when they reported on the results of their survey in November 1993.

All right, so impact number one: The tax is killing the business.

Let's take a look at impact number two. What about the revenues? The minister estimated that this new tax would generate \$5 million for the period from August 1, 1993, to April 1, 1994, and that it would generate \$10 million per full fiscal year thereafter. In other words, we're trying to find out if, as a result of the new tax, we're going to come out making any money on this thing or if the only accomplishment is going to be that we're killing what had been a successful small business enterprise in the province.

In fact, the numbers show that the government is earning less now with the new tax than it had before this new tax had ever been implemented. So the government is now not only losing revenues from the businesses which are going under, including lost provincial sales tax and provincial income tax, plus the contributions those businesses make to their local economy, plus the moneys they provide for UIC and welfare programs, social benefits, things of that nature, not only has it had those tremendously harmful effects but they're making less money from the tax than they had before the tax had ever been implemented.

The question of course is, why? Why did they go ahead with this tax in the first place? Now that it's in place and it's so obvious to all that it's having such a harmful effect on the industry, why do they persist in allowing it to remain in place? Revenues are down, businesses are closing, people are losing their businesses, their homes, and people are losing, of course, their jobs; they're being put out of work.

On top of all this, to add insult to injury, the government intends to raise the tax to 31 cents per litre and then 38 cents per litre; 31 cents this June, 38 cents next June.

The other interesting aspect about this tax is that we're told it's a sales tax, and indeed it's found within Bill 138, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act. But I think by any reasonable definition of the word "sale," there is no sale here.

1530

Let me describe for you what happens when you go into one of these stores. You walk in the front door and you see people at the desk and you pay your money to buy ingredients and you pay tax on that. Then you pay some money to get a service component. They tell you how to put this stuff together and how to store it and those kinds of things, and you pay GST on that.



You then mix them together, and when you leave the store, they say, "Well, hang on a sec, we want some more money from you." But there is no sale transaction taking place there. You've already bought the ingredients, you already bought the service, but they are hitting you with another tax. Again, there's no sale by any broad stretch of the imagination whatsoever, and that is going to be the subject of a legal challenge, I predict.

The other problem associated with this tax is that it's unduly complicated for the operators. The mechanics just haven't been properly thought through. Now when you go in, as I say, you're charged your provincial sales tax, you're charged your goods and services tax, and then you pay 26 cents a litre. Some of the people are charging this up front.

When you make a batch of this stuff, beer or wine, it's sometimes, in fact all the time, difficult to tell how many litres you're going to end up with, because some of it you're going to spill and sometimes you make more than you thought originally and sometimes you make less.

If the government insists on going ahead with this tax, I think at a minimum it should consent to incorporating this tax simply through the provincial sales tax so you pay up front as a percentage of the cost of your ingredients. It's certainly less complicated and you don't have to get into this concern about how many litres you're going to end up with at the end of the day.

When you look back at this thing, it's nothing short of a small-business tragedy for the industry which had, as I said, been one of those all-too-rare success stories in this province. It had been growing at a remarkable rate. It is one of those industries which is—I think there were a few stores out west, but it started here in Ontario, by and large, and it was in its infancy.

Many of these stores were still in their first year, and if you have any passing acquaintance with small business operations, you've got to understand how vulnerable industries are, particularly during their first year. All of them were less than four years old, and many of them were only in their first year.

Now the thinking has become I guess commonplace to the point of being trite but it's worth repeating over and over again, and I think one of the ministers here in response to a question earlier today made reference to this fact: This government, any government, by and large does not create jobs. It does not create business.

Small businesses will create those jobs that we are all looking forward to seeing in this province, and government's responsibility is to create an environment where those businesses can not only survive but indeed thrive. In that way government can play a vital role in helping us all out of this economic morass in which we find ourselves. It's the small businesses that are going to create the jobs, and they're the ones that are going to give people spending money that they can use to help get the economy going.

My local paper, the *Ottawa Citizen*, wrote an editorial entitled "U-Brew Tax Folly," which appeared in the November 26, 1993, edition. I want to quote from that because I think it's well put. It says as follows:

"The U-brew tax, which took effect in August, is the fiscal equivalent of shooting yourself, and everyone else, in the foot. Here's what it has accomplished:

"—Reduced the province's total tax revenues from the brew-it-yourself industry.

"—Contributed to a loss of 400 full-time and part-time jobs.

"—Increased welfare and unemployment insurance costs through payments to these former workers.

"—Forced dozens of small business entrepreneurs into receivership and bankruptcy.

"—Failed to protect market share for the big breweries, or jobs for their unionized employees—the real reason the tax was introduced.

"But the U-brew tax has, as Laughren promised when it was introduced in May, levelled the playing field. The surviving brew-it-yourself operations are now in just as bad economic shape as the province."

I guess the long and the short of it is that this government took a silk purse and turned it into a sow's ear. It took a good-news story and turned it into a bad-news story. We had a small-business industry which was thriving, which was growing; it was creating jobs, it was helping people meet their expenses, raise their families, put the kids through school, put money in the church basket on Sundays.

This government, through lack of foresight, through lack of careful study and by refusing to listen to the people who are affected by this on the front lines—the small-business operators, the you-brew people—succeeded in killing, or is presently killing, that business. I think that's a terrible tragedy and it's unforgivable, because it was all preventable. That's what makes it all the more tragic.

How about a bit of good news in all this? I have heard that the government is now reconsidering this tax. I have heard that it is considering imposing a moratorium on the two additional increments of the tax, which are scheduled to become effective in June of this year and June of the following year, 1995. If that's true, then I'm going to have to congratulate the government.

I also hear that the government is thinking of reducing the tax which is presently in effect—a tax where you have to pay 26 cents a litre on the beer or wine you make in these places—to 15 cents a litre. Again, if that is true, I will be the first to stand up in this House and congratulate the government for doing so.

But I also then, as now, will criticize them for ever having put this tax into place in the first place and, second, for taking so darn long to pull it off the books, because the real tragedy in all of this is that we have lost jobs. People have lost their businesses, they've lost a lot of money.

Bankers and lenders, feeling that they've been burned on this, will be very concerned about lending money again when the government can willy-nilly pull the rug out from under people's feet, change the rules of the game while the game is still in play and add a new tax when people were not expecting it.

Of course, families have been hurt by this. One of the things that we overlook, I think, far too often in this House—we get caught up in numbers and statistics; we enter into esoteric or academic discussions—is that families, people, flesh and blood hurt when they lose their jobs, when somebody in the family loses their job.

Studies show—I hate to refer to studies, but you've got to rely on them from time to time—that when a family member loses a job, the entire family suffers. There's a greater incidence of physical violence in that family, for instance. There's a greater incidence of drug or alcohol abuse. The kids don't do as well in school. All of that is borne out through studies and all of that with respect to this particular tax, which affects the brew-on-premises industry, was completely needless.

The industry had indicated at the outset that it was going to have a very harmful impact on the industry, that people were going to lose their jobs, that at a minimum they would have to lay off some of their employees. The government did not listen. The government, like desperate people, resorted to desperate measures. It felt that it was short of revenue, and there's no doubt that it is short of revenue in some ways, but rather than focusing on other, more responsible measures, including reducing its own expenses, it struck out in a desperate effort to bring in more money, and in so doing it caused some severe damage to an industry which had been growing and thriving in this province.

1540

I just noticed, interestingly enough, in yesterday's Toronto Star, April 12, that this brew-your-own industry which has grown here is now establishing itself—it's Ontario-based—in the United States. There was only one brew-on-premises store, remarkably, found within the United States of America.

Our people here who had a good idea and implemented it, created an industry and employed people, paid taxes and raised families, as a result of the environment the government has created through the implementation of a new tax, have now gone south of the border to make some money there.

As I said at the outset, this is a perfect case study—I think it ought to be made mandatory reading for all government members—in how to kill a small-business industry which had been doing so well on its own as a result of the industry, the goodwill, the efforts and the money of small-business entrepreneurs in this province.

There are a number of other aspects to Bill 138 which I'm not going to comment on. My colleagues will do so quite eloquently, no doubt. Just in passing, may I say that you don't have to spend too much time outside of this place to talk to real people at the street level to gain an understanding that there is simply no tolerance whatsoever left for increased taxes in this province. People have had it up to here and beyond when it comes to taxes.

We are at, I would submit, a point which is perilously close to the edge in terms of driving good, law-abiding people in this province who are resorting to the black market over that edge. We saw that in the cigarette smuggling problem. There was a focus on those people

who were supplying those cigarettes, and no doubt they share some of the blame, but there is a very receptive market for those cigarettes. We have grandmothers, we have aunts, we have brothers and sisters and cousins and friends who are now finding it acceptable to engage in and profit by some black-market activity of one kind or another.

Just try to get a price on something in the Ottawa area, for instance, try to get the price for some work done on your roof, some plumbing, some guy to do the driveway or whatever. They'll always have two prices, and one is remarkably lower than the other. That's because it has become commonplace, it has become acceptable, unfortunately all too much so, for people to consider that they no longer have to abide by our laws. That is because they have lost faith in the government's ability to properly manage the moneys that it's already receiving and they have no tolerance whatsoever for any more taxes.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any questions or comments? Any further debate?

**Mr David Johnson (Don Mills):** I am delighted to rise to speak to this issue. In starting off, since my area of interest is municipal affairs, I'm going to make just one or two comments with regard to the impact of this bill on municipalities.

The member for Ottawa South has mentioned the impact on the you-brew industry in the province of Ontario. I think he's done an admirable job on that and I'll come back to that in a minute. But I think we should understand that through this bill, there are ramifications on the municipalities.

Now, in this day and age, particularly with the government spending being what it is, taxation being what it is, we all recognize that there has to be restraint, that all levels of government have to follow a program of restraint. That's true of the federal government, the provincial government and municipalities. Nevertheless, I think we should understand what is happening through legislation that is being passed through this House.

I take the city of Toronto as one example that's close to home, since we're located in the city of Toronto at the present time. Last year, through the expenditure control program, the city of Toronto was reduced by \$3.5 million in terms of the grant from the provincial government. Through the social contract program, they were reduced a further \$14.2 million. Then you come to other ways that the municipality loses money from the provincial government, and this bill is a case in point, Bill 138.

The parking authority for the city of Toronto of course collects fees from numerous parking spaces across the city of Toronto. This bill, Bill 138, imposes a provincial sales tax on the parking fees. In the first six months of the implementation of this bill last year, the revenues lost by the parking authority of the city of Toronto were between \$1.2 million and \$1.3 million: \$1.2 million to \$1.3 million was the cost from this bill to the parking authority of the city of Toronto. On an annualized basis, about \$2.5 million will be lost to the parking authority of the city of Toronto as a result of the implementation of Bill 138, the PST, provincial sales tax, on parking charges for the city of Toronto parking authority.



That's what I call downloading. That is the long arm of the provincial government going down into the revenue base of the municipalities, grabbing a mittful of money and pulling it back up to the provincial government. I think we should recognize that that is happening.

The city of North York lost, through the expenditure control program and the social contract program, over \$8 million. Measures had to be taken, there's no question about it, by the provincial government to rein in the spending. I can tell you that I'm supportive of measures to rein in the spending, and the Progressive Conservative Party is supportive of measures to bring down the spending.

But again, here is a bill that comes through with little fanfare, another form of downloading to the municipality that will cost the parking authority in the city of North York about \$200,000 a year. In the first six months, \$100,000 was paid from the parking authority of the city to the provincial government in the form of provincial sales taxes as a result of this bill that we're debating today.

I might add that the total cost of this bill to the city of North York and to the taxpayers of the city of North York will be about \$900,000. That \$900,000 will include not only—well, actually, it doesn't include the PST on the parking. What it includes is the PST on employee benefits, on various insurance programs that are contained within the city of North York. Again, what we have is the provincial sales tax being employed against insurance programs, provincial sales tax being employed against sand, gravel and limestone that are purchased by the municipalities across Ontario. There is a price to be paid by the municipalities in the province of Ontario as a result of this bill. The direct price to the city of North York, as one example, is about \$900,000 a year.

As another example, in the borough of East York, that price will be about \$250,000 a year, \$250,000 due to the sales tax on parking meters, due to the sales tax on employee benefits, due to the sales tax on liability and property insurance and due to the sales tax now imposed on sand, gravel and limestone and those kinds of products.

1550

I think the public should be aware of what is happening here, that the provincial government is putting its hand into all of the municipalities in Ontario and that cost will have to be borne by the property taxpayers.

I might say it's not just the municipalities. The Toronto Transit Commission: I'm sure this government would say that the better way to travel is by public transit and would encourage people to travel by public transit. Here's how Bill 138 encourages public transit in Metropolitan Toronto. It is costing the Toronto Transit Commission, this year, in its budget, \$2.2 million to pay for the provincial sales tax on dental programs, on health programs and other benefit programs instituted by the Toronto Transit Commission. That's \$2.2 million the Toronto Transit Commission has to find in its budget this year as a result of this bill, Bill 138, that we're debating today.

That is how this government is encouraging the users of the TTC. I might add it also will cost about \$60,000 this year in terms of the PST on parking charges in the parking lots that the Toronto Transit Commission owns and manages.

Those are the costs that are being transferred from this provincial government, this provincial government which has mismanaged its finances now for a number of years, this provincial government which, as in the headline in the Toronto Sun of a couple of weeks ago, has its credit rating at risk. Standard and Poor's is saying that it currently has a AA- rating for the province of Ontario, but it's keeping its eye on the province of Ontario. They're concerned not only about the revenues, I might add, but they're concerned about the expenditures as well.

This province of Ontario has suffered, I believe it is, three credit downratings in the last three or four years through this government and, I must also add in fairness, as a result of the contribution of the Liberal government before that.

This is how the government is trying to manage its affairs, by pushing its burden down to the municipalities and hospitals, boards of education, indeed the private enterprise as well, any employer that has insurance programs, for example, or auto insurance at a rate of sales tax of 5%. In all of those cases, it's trying to manage its burden by getting more revenue from municipalities and school boards, hospitals, you name it.

I was actually stunned by some of the statistics when I was bringing material together to speak today. I knew that in terms of tax increases, it had not been good, but when you look at what has happened over the last few years, I was amazed to see that since 1985, people in the province of Ontario have had to absorb \$7.6 billion in new or increased taxes—\$7.6 billion provincially, going back to 1985. I might add that's for the various Liberal governments as well as the NDP government.

From 1985 to 1993, the personal income per capita in Ontario did increase by 53.5%. Some people would've earned considerably more; some people a little bit more; perhaps some people even less, but the average income gain in the province of Ontario was 53.5% from 1985 up to the end of last year.

But how much did the tax burden increase in the province of Ontario? By 73.3%. The tax burden outstripped the gain in income per capita by almost 20 percentage points. If the people of the province of Ontario feel a little bit poorer today than they did in 1985, they're right, they are poorer. The tax rate went up considerably more than did their income.

In 1985, provincial tax revenues equalled 8.8% of the Ontario gross domestic product, but now they account for 11.2% of our gross domestic product. This is serious. Taxes are going up, they're costing everybody more money and they're consuming a larger portion of our gross domestic product.

A firm called Global Economics Ltd did an analysis of the three budgets put forward by this government and found that as a result the average family in Ontario paid \$663 more in taxes in 1993, as a result of the three

budgets of this government. These are just facts.

When I look back through the tax increases, which are having a dramatic effect, a frightening impact on our society, I think the member for Ottawa South before me mentioned the impact on small businesses, but it's the impact not only on small businesses but all components of our economic life in Ontario; all of our businesses, large and small. You look back and you see huge tax increases in 1988, huge tax increases in 1989 and the largest increase in taxes of all in 1993. That's the substance of this bill today: Bill 138 is implementing some of those tax increases from 1993.

I might add, just in fairness to the government, that of course this bill does do away with the tire tax. Congratulations. That's wonderful news. Yes, you deserve congratulations. That tire tax, to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, I'm sure cost his constituents a great deal of money and they must have wondered where on earth that money was going to. We've wondered where that money was going to, too. That tire tax was implemented by Bob Nixon in 1989, I guess it was. That was an amazing year. In 1989-1990 the Liberal government implemented 16 tax increases. That's, I think, an all-time record: 16 tax increases. They increased the personal income tax, gasoline and fuel taxes. they implemented the tire tax, the gas guzzler tax, the commercial concentration tax.

**Hon Elmer Buchanan (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** That was a winner.

**Mr David Johnson:** That was a winner, that's right. The Minister of Agriculture has indicated that was a real winner, the commercial concentration tax. Probably the most hated tax in the province of Ontario, in the history of the province of Ontario was that commercial concentration—and the one with the least amount of rationale behind it. I recall on the radio that evening, the Treasurer at that time trying to explain it to the financial gurus on CFRB. He was totally flustered, had no idea how it worked and was eaten alive by the financial analysts on CFRB. Again, congratulations to this government, not in this bill, but at some other time they have implemented the end, the death of the commercial concentration tax, and that was a good move.

But 1989, 1990 under the Liberal regime, over \$1 billion in taxes, 16 tax increases, one of them being the tire tax. Today, we see the end of the tire tax through Bill 138 and I applaud the government for that. I might say that, over the course of its history, that tire tax generated about \$200 million. That's the best we can make out of it. We tried to get the figures from the government, and while I congratulate it for deleting that tax through this bill, it could have done it last year; it could have done it the previous year.

1600

We estimate about \$200 million was raised. How much of that money went for the purpose that Bob Nixon felt it should go in the first place? The best estimate we have is that probably at most \$30 million of the \$200 million was directed for research into recycling and reduction projects to deal with the 10 million tires every year that are waste in the province of Ontario. It's a frightening number: 10 million tires each and every year that are

waste. What to do with these tires?

When that tax was implemented, there was no thought as to how the money would be spent. The only idea was, "If we collect the money, we'll find some way to spend it." What happened? The money went into general revenues and wasn't used for that purpose. So that's the end of that particular tax, and we're thankful for it.

This budget, as I indicated earlier, does implement a provincial sales tax on insurance programs. This is going to impact municipalities, it's going to impact school boards, hospitals, you name it, but it impacts individual people as well.

When I talked to an insurance agent who contacted me, he said he found it most interesting that when the government was in opposition, one of its main concerns was the auto insurance program in the province of Ontario and how it intended to deal with auto insurance and make it a public auto insurance program. This government, when it was in opposition, felt people were being ripped off by the auto insurance program in Ontario.

Now, through Bill 164, we see increases. In Bill 164, which this government has introduced, not only are there increases, which people are finding hard to stomach, but secondly, the government's taxing the increases. They're taxing auto insurance.

This is causing problems. I can tell you a couple of problems it's causing. One is that there was no lead time given to the auto insurance industry. Many of the auto insurance brokers generate their bills through a computer system. What they found was that it was too late to adjust those bills. So the wrong bills went out without the PST added. Then they had to send out a second bill to collect the PST, the provincial sales tax. You can imagine how delighted people were to receive a second bill about the sales tax. This caused a considerable amount of trouble, but I guess they've worked their way through that by now.

Nevertheless, what's happening is that people's incomes are not going up in this day and age. Many people are unemployed. Many people are either underemployed or unemployed and they haven't got the money to pay for these kinds of increases. So what they're doing in some cases is what the insurance brokers call stripping their policy. They're assuming more risk, a higher deductibility for example, reducing their coverage. I hope the government understands this when it throws taxes on top of what happened in Bill 164. The increases through 164, the increases because of this bill, the provincial sales tax, people are having to assume more risk through their auto insurance, through their home insurance. They just haven't got the money to pay for these things.

Indeed, talking to one broker, he said that he was suspicious that some people unfortunately, with their home insurance, may not even be having home insurance. They may not be able to pay for it. Consequently, they're assuming a tremendous risk. I hope that's not the case, but I wonder if that was researched by the government. I wonder if the government understood its impact on people in this day and age when they haven't got the money to pay for these sorts of things. It's most serious.



Not only that; this government is concerned about job loss. Well, what's happening in the insurance business today as a result of Bill 164, as a result of the sales tax? I can tell you a couple of things that are happening in insurance. One is that there are some mergers that are under way. Jobs are being lost; jobs are being lost through either mergers or some insurance agents going under, so we're experiencing job loss.

Another thing that's happening, and you may or may not have much sympathy for it, I don't know—I have a letter from Kawasaki in the motorcycle field. They're not renewing insurance. To name two firms that have had to withdraw from the insurance field because it just isn't economically viable—I respect that it has to make economic sense for them to stay in the field—Progressive and Dominion of Canada have had to withdraw from insuring motorcycles. So if you had an insurance policy with one of those two firms, you won't be able to get one for motorcycles in the future. This is what's happening.

Does the government understand the impact that it's having? Do they do a cost-benefit analysis? Do they try to make these things make sense? The answer is obviously no. Put in policies driven by some philosophy and see what happens. Well, what happens in the motorcycle field is disasters. What's happening to municipalities is downloading. What's happening to people who are needing to buy auto insurance or home insurance is that they're stripping their policies. What's happening to the you-brews? This was the topic earlier. The you-brews are going out of business.

We said this here in the House. Gary Carr, one of our members, questioned the Premier and said that this would have an impact on the you-brews. Through Bill 138—

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** Read the answer.

**Mr David Johnson:** Yes. Okay. The member opposite says, "Read the answer." The answer was, and this is from Bob Rae, Premier, "This tax was brought in to create a sense of balance in the overall industry"—create a sense of balance. Now I ask you, balance, here's what we've got: Business in the you-brew industry has gone down—various estimates: 40% is a modest estimate. I talked to one of the operators who has a business up the road from me, just a few doors: before the bill, four, five batches a day; after the bill, one or two batches a day—that's a drop of way more than 40%—some days none. He's hanging on.

**Mr Fletcher:** Oh, it is not.

**Mr David Johnson:** Well, work it out: four to five batches a day as opposed to one to two batches a day. He's hanging on. I'll wager you he doesn't cover his expenses.

**Mr Fletcher:** How big's a batch?

**Mr David Johnson:** The batches are the same size: 48 litres for a batch.

Now what's going to happen? The member for Ottawa South says, from what he understands, the government is finally having second thoughts on the impact of taxes on small business, taxes on everybody. I say hallelujah. They're having second thoughts in this particular area and they may not implement the two tax increases on the

you-brews, where you brew your own beer, make your own wine; they may not implement the tax increases for June this year and June 1995. Well, I hope so. Let's have a little ray of light on this issue. They may even roll back the tax that's on already.

If you don't roll back the tax that's on already, at least 30 members of this industry have gone under already, and that's a low estimate. We see various newspaper reports about those who've gone under, but at least 30 members. It's not a level playing field. I ask the member opposite, is a level playing field that your business drops 40% and that at least 30 of the you-brew businesses in the province of Ontario, and we suspect many, many more, have gone under? That's hardly a level playing field. What was done amply demonstrates the tremendous impact of putting taxes on small business without understanding the consequences. We warned that this would happen; it's happened. People have gone out of business. Jobs are being lost.

The revenue, and this is somewhat interesting: The government apparently estimated that as a result of the 26 cents-per-litre tax on the you-brew industry, \$5 million would be generated in revenue. What has actually been generated? The assumption is that you put a tax on and people just merely go along and do business as if the tax didn't exist, and that they just happily pay the tax. Well, it doesn't happen. Unfortunately, it affects the whole business.

1610

What happened was that the gap between what you can buy from a Brewers Retail and what you pay at the you-brew narrowed, and people stop buying. When people stop buying, even though you put the tax on, you get less than what you projected.

*Interjection.*

**Mr David Johnson:** I'm sure the member would be interested in this. Instead of \$5 million taxes, what's been taken in is about \$1.2 million. Now, we're not all the way through a full year yet, but it's abundantly clear that less than projected tax revenue will actually be collected.

It demonstrates what we've been saying over and over again:

We have hit the tax wall. The more taxes we put on—for example, the budget as a whole that this particular bill has come out of put in place some \$2 billion worth of tax increases, the highest I'm aware of in the history of the province: \$2 billion in tax increases. Did we get that money? We know we didn't get it on the you-brews, because as a result of the tax, the you-brews became uncompetitive and you didn't get the revenue.

What about the rest of the budget? Did you get it in the rest of the budget? The answer is no. The answer is that the estimates for revenue are going down on a day-by-day basis, and the deficit, which was forecast at some \$9.5 billion this past year ending March 31, a deficit in the operating expenses of \$9.5 billion, is going up and up, because we are not getting the money in. People have hit the wall.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business has an article on this. I wish I had time to read it. They say

if people do not respect what and how taxes are being collected, they stop paying. They go underground. The underground economy is flourishing. The building trades industry indicates that about 41% of renovations in that industry are underground. The taxes are simply too high. People don't consider them justifiable.

So what's happening in the province of Ontario, unfortunately, is that the government is trying to deal with the enormous deficit issue: \$9.5 billion forecast, but in actual fact I'm sure it'll be over \$10 billion by the time all the reckoning is in; \$12 billion the year before that; in total almost \$80 billion dollars debt accumulated, about \$30 billion of that since this government has been in place, an \$80-billion debt owed by the people of the province of Ontario as a result of government mismanagement.

It simply points out that we can't, as a government, keep adding tax upon tax. People will not pay. That's the position we're in. That's why we have a debt of \$80 billion and that's why we have deficits that continue to be around \$10 billion each and every year. And that's why I certainly won't be supporting this bill. While I applaud the elimination of the tire tax, I cannot support a bill that brings in a tax on auto insurance, I cannot support a bill that brings in a tax on home insurance, I cannot support a bill that brings in taxes on many other aspects of our life here in Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Thank you to the member for Don Mills for his participation in this debate. Now we have time for questions or comments to the member.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** As usual, my colleague the member for Don Mills has brought some cogent comments to this debate, a debate which I will be joining shortly. I would just like to comment on how clearly he stated the seriousness of the problem and the impact of the fact that Ontario has hit the tax wall, a fact that this government hasn't recognized yet but which the business community has recognized. The impact of that is to attack job creation.

We're losing jobs in this province because of the tax and regulatory regime that exists in this province, a province which used to enjoy one of the lowest tax rates in Canada but which, after 33 tax grabs by the Liberals in just five years and 22 by the NDP in just three years, is now the most heavily taxed administration not just in Canada but in the whole of North America. In an increasingly competitive world, that translates in job losses. And it isn't just one single tax, it's a culmination of all of the tax grabs.

My friend, who represents his constituents very admirably, has brought forward some useful suggestions to the government, which I suspect it won't pay any attention to. But it isn't they that suffer, it is the people of Ontario and the job losses. Unless this government, and any future government, recognize that we need less taxes not more taxes, we'll continue to see these job losses.

**The Acting Speaker:** Any further comments or questions? Seeing none, the member for Don Mills may wish to respond.

**Mr David Johnson:** I wish to thank the member for York Mills. It's probably the member for York Mills who impressed this situation on me the most, as a new member just about a year ago here in this Legislature. The member for York Mills has been consistent in terms of his concern about and opposition to tax increases and the impact of those tax increases on the business community of the province. I thank him not only for his comments today but for his tutoring, I guess, over the past year, since I've been in here, to impress this upon me. I hope the message has sunk in for me and I hope it sinks in for the government.

The people watching or government members may say, "Well, that's just a Progressive Conservative blowing smoke," but I was looking at an article from late last year in the Financial Post. It says the Provincial Auditor has slammed the Treasurer, Floyd Laughren, and his decision in the 1992-93 budget to defer \$584 million in payments to the teachers' and public service pension funds and concluded that the treatment was unusual.

It's been brought up here before that the auditor has refused to sign the books, and the government says, "No, the auditor didn't refuse to sign the books," etc etc. But what happened was that the auditor, for the first time in the province's history, it says here in the Financial Post of October 1993, has already issued a qualified endorsement of Ontario's books. In accounting terms, that's pretty severe. You can quibble about words, whether he signed or didn't sign, but the fact is that the auditor for the province of Ontario shares my concern, shares the concerns of the member for York Mills, and only issued a qualified endorsement of Ontario's books and noted various discrepancies as the reason for that.

**The Acting Speaker:** Now we can have further debate on second reading of Bill 138, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax.

1620

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I rise to talk about Bill 138 and specifically how that bill has affected a great many people in my riding of Mississauga North. As you know, Madam Speaker, my riding of Mississauga North is all that area of Mississauga north of Eglinton Avenue. It comprises communities such as Malton and Meadowvale and Meadowvale Village, Streetsville and East Credit. I must tell you, since the government introduced Bill 138, it didn't take long before I was receiving telephone calls and letters about how it would affect people on the street, really affect them in their day-to-day lives.

But to backtrack one moment, we know that Bill 138 was presented just last December and contains changes to the Retail Sales Tax Act. Those changes were originally outlined in last year's budget. As I indicated, this has caused some real problems, not only in my riding but probably right across the province.

The act sort of zeroes in on three areas: first, changes to allow sales tax to be charged on metered parking; second, provisions to tax brew-your-own retail establishments; and third, changes to include insurance premiums as taxable. In the time permitted this afternoon, I'm just going to deal with two areas of Bill 138, the provisions



to tax the brew-your-own retail establishments and the changes to include insurance premiums as taxable.

On the issue of brew-your-own, we have been fortunate, not only in my riding but I believe throughout the city of Mississauga, the regional municipality of Peel and indeed in areas throughout the province, that entrepreneurs, small business people took it upon themselves to open up brew-your-own premises. Bill 138 will set the tax rate on the beer and wine which is produced at these brew-your-own establishments.

I think those who are watching on television know what these brew-your-own establishments look like. You've seen them in your local plazas, in your shopping malls. They have been a source of employment. They were a source of growth. They were a success story in small business entrepreneurship during a recession. So what does the government do to what was a success story?

Under Bill 138, the government wants people who make these products for their own consumption or on behalf of someone else to pay a new levy on that production, and this all means nothing else than taxes: 26 cents per litre of beer or wine produced on or after August 1, 1993, and before June 15, 1994. That rises from 26 cents per litre to 31 cents to June 15, 1995, and after that it goes to 38 cents per litre.

A lot of numbers, but the fact of the matter is that the government saw a success story. It saw establishments creating jobs, it saw people being employed. And this was being done during a recession. What does the government do to those people who not only are combating the recession but beating it? They tax them.

What is the result of this? The result of this is such as a letter I received from the Mississauga and Oakville brew clubs. It was written to me just last February. Writing are "two of Mississauga's entrepreneurial business people who were encouraged by both the provincial and the federal governments to go forth and create new opportunities for employment, support other business through purchases and provide more tax dollars for all levels of government."

The letter goes on to say:

"We did that by creating the Mississauga Brew Club, a brew-on-premise," which is located in my riding, and also the Oakville Brew Club in the adjoining riding. "We have invested all of our personal resources earned and saved over the past 30 years and have worked extremely long and hard hours to make our business successful."

These were people thumbing their nose at the recession and saying, "With hard work, with an investment of resource and time, we can make a go of it and we can create jobs."

The letter goes on to say:

"Then the Ontario government...introduced a regressive tax"—this is Bill 138—"that has endangered our business and that of others in similar situations."

They are saying that the huge increase in provincial tax that this bill was supposed to generate did not happen. Instead, and here is the sad part of this, "many brew-on-premises have either gone out of business or are in

danger of doing so.... With the loss of these businesses will come the domino effect of unemployment, decreased sales to supporting businesses, reduction of tax base to all levels of government, some personal bankruptcies and so on."

They ask me, as their member, to stand up and speak against this tax, which I do now.

It is incredible to me that we have an establishment, a series of establishments which were successful, which were working hard, which were employing people, which were, as a result, creating tax dollars coming in to the government, and the government does its best to put these successes out of business by putting on this incredible tax. This tax is nothing less than a grab on the small entrepreneurial sector, and the government knows that the way they are dispersed they don't have the associations to fight back. The government saw an easy target for a tax hit and they hit them hard.

This government, through this portion of Bill 138, has caused people who have been successful during a recession to go out of business. This government, through this bill, has caused people who have employed people in a recession to have to let them go. The government has caused unemployment, it has caused a problem where none existed before, and it should be roundly criticized in being so out of touch with what is happening in the cities of the province. You're so out of touch that you would put people out of work when they had been making a go of it.

The second area that I wish to talk about, and I wish to talk briefly on this, is another area which has really had an effect in my riding, again I believe reflective of all ridings, and that is the tax on the insurance, because Bill 138 extends the provincial retail sales tax to auto and group insurance policies. The legislation adds a 5% tax on to the cost of car insurance premiums. Of course, now a person with, for instance, a \$1,200 car insurance policy will pay \$36 in premium tax and an extra \$61.80 in new tax, for a total new tax of \$97.80.

We have to remember that this is causing a problem to people across the province. Now on their insurance premiums not only do they have to pay their premium, they have to pay a tax on their premium. There are many people now who are receiving their insurance premium notices. They are seeing that tax. They are also seeing two other things.

The second thing they are seeing is that the premiums themselves have gone up, and the reason they have gone up is because of that government's, the Bob Rae government's ill-conceived insurance plan which has done nothing less than increase risk. When you increase risk, that increased risk is reflected in the premium, and the people pay for that. So the people are paying not only tax on their premium but also a tax on an increased premium, which results in more money out of their pockets.

The third thing in this area that the government has done is—and people will see this in their insurance premiums—that there is now the opportunity for people to have increased income protection coverage. It was not necessary until the government brought forward, again, this ill-conceived insurance plan.

What people are going to be hit with in their insurance is, firstly, increased premium because of the government increasing the risk. Secondly, they're going to have to pay almost a surcharge in order to get appropriate income-replacement coverage. Thirdly, on all of that is the Bill 138 tax on the premium. It hits everybody. It doesn't matter what your income is. It is a regressive tax. It takes money out of the pockets of the people at the worst possible time.

One asks: "What is the reason for this type of tax? What is the need to hit people at every income level so hard at a time when they can least afford it?" The government has no answer to that, except to say, "It's a tax grab," and that's what it is.

1630

I am very concerned with Bill 138. I am very concerned about how it has really hurt people in ridings such as mine in terms of taking money right out of their pockets. I am concerned with Bill 138 and how it has devastated the brew-your-own premises and establishments which we shouldn't have been attacking, which the government shouldn't have been attacking.

They should have been using the brew-your-own premises as an example for other establishments to follow: examples of success stories, examples of employment opportunities. But no, they've ripped them apart, they've ripped them really out of our economy. They caused unemployment with this particular bill.

It is a bad bill, it is an ill-conceived bill, it is a bill which hurts the common person, the middle-class person, by taking money out of their pockets and, for many, taking the jobs out of their lives. It is a bad, ill-conceived bill and something this government should be roundly criticized for. They should be deservedly ashamed that they even introduced it.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you to the member for his participation. Questions or comments to the member?

**Mrs Barbara Sullivan (Halton Centre):** I want to commend my colleague from Mississauga North, particularly for raising the issue of the Oakville and Mississauga brew clubs in his remarks on this bill. The Oakville Brew Club is located in my constituency and Mr Offer and I, of course, represent adjacent constituencies.

The people associated with this business have indeed contributed not only to job creation in our community but also very much in other activities in the community that they can now afford to do because they are business people in the community. I think it's very clear that they see a direct impact on the operation of their business through a reluctance of the consumer to continue to use their products and the opportunities for using their products. They feel this bill will create a domino effect that will mean their contributions to the economy overall, through other purchases they might make as a business and through purchases that are made through their own stores, will cease.

The other aspect is with respect to the decrease in the tax base as a result of this tax. When businesses go out of business, they don't pay tax.

**Mr Turnbull:** I listened very attentively to what the

member for Mississauga North had to say. In many respects I agreed with what he had to say about the misdirection the government has taken. However, I really feel he was shedding some crocodile tears when you consider that many of the problems this government has were created by the previous Liberal administration.

I know when he gets up he's going to say how wrong this is, but the fact is they increased taxes, during boom times, 33 times. Did they use it to pay down any debt that existed? No, they didn't. They added \$10 billion to the accumulated debt of this province in just five years. They were the best years, arguably, this province has ever been through, yet they added \$10 billion.

I remember the last election when I was campaigning against a Liberal incumbent, and at an all-candidates meeting he got up and he started saying, "Yes, there had been an increase of \$5 billion." I was just almost salivating, wanting to jump up. The Libertarian candidate got up and she very quietly produced two copies of the budget: the last Conservative budget and the last Liberal budget. She read from it.

I was going to say \$10 billion; she said it was slightly more than \$10 billion. But during the best five years that this province has ever had they added \$10 billion to the debt. When are you ever going to pay off debt if you add during the best times? They added 33 tax increases and they took Ontario from being a relatively low-tax administration to the most heavily taxed place in North America.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker: We should have a quorum, I think.

**The Acting Speaker:** Would the clerk determine if a quorum is present, please.

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex McFedries):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** We have time for further questions or comments to the member for Mississauga North. Any further comments? Seeing none, the member for Mississauga North has two minutes to respond.

**Mr Offer:** Very briefly, I want to thank the member for Halton Centre for supporting the brew-your-own establishments and for clearly indicating how this particular Bill 138 has hurt the brew-your-own establishments in her riding and certainly, as I think we know, in many other ridings.

I also want to take a moment to thank Gerry and Susan O'Connor of the Mississauga/Oakville Brew Clubs who have taken it upon themselves to clearly articulate what the impact of Bill 138 is all about in terms of their being able to continue on, in terms of the type of the commitment they have made, in terms of the way in which they were trying to create jobs and how they were representative of a group of people who were in a recession, making a success of establishments, employing people and having those people pay but obviously contribute to the tax structure of this province.

The member for York Mills has gone off on another



type of a tangent and I certainly look forward to a forthcoming debate on particular parties' records. I certainly recognize that in an area such as ours in Mississauga and in the regional municipality of Peel many of those tax revenues were used to build schools, public elementary and high schools, separate schools, public and elementary, were used to improve hospitals in our riding, were used to improve the services within. I certainly look forward to discussing that in the future.

This bill is a bad bill hurting a great many middle-class people.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Turnbull:** I believe it would be appropriate that we had a quorum, and the government is responsible to have a quorum in the House, because I do intend to point out a few things that it's doing wrong.

**The Acting Speaker:** Would the clerk determine if there is a quorum present.

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*  
1640

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for York Mills now has the floor.

**Mr Turnbull:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it is appropriate that we have the government here to listen to the comments that my constituents are giving me about this budget and the budget measures.

When I look at the efforts of this government to kill the democratic process, I'm rather disgusted, but first of all, let me just read some of the opening remarks by the parliamentary secretary in opening this debate. He said:

"The bill proposes to apply retail sales tax to premiums paid under insurance contracts, group insurance, funded or unfunded benefit plans, effective May 20, 1993. The major exemptions include individual policies for life, health and physical wellbeing and reinsurance, farm and crop insurance, marine insurance, unemployment insurance and workers' compensation." Well, whoopee-do that they've exempted those. "A special rate of 5% will apply to auto insurance, covering all licensed vehicles.

"Tax will also be applied to charges made for parking, effective July 1, 1993."

The parliamentary secretary went on to say at a later date:

"I hope that as part of the debate, while no one likes tax increases or supports them, we remember the context of the budget in 1993. Of course if the government had not done anything at that time, we would have been looking at a deficit of well over \$16 billion."

**Mr Stockwell:** That's bunk.

**Mr Turnbull:** What a load of rubbish. What a load of absolutely unadulterated rubbish. You know, this is the same trick that municipalities get up to where they say, "Oh, we're going to have huge increases," and then they don't come in quite as much, and then people say, "Oh, well, it wasn't as bad as we thought."

You know, the taxpayer is fed up with shell games, and I've used this expression on many occasions in this House. The kind of tactics this government is getting up to are such that if you were doing it on an orange crate on the corner of a street, the police would arrest you for it. You'd have to have somebody checking at the corner to make sure you weren't doing it.

The budget was brought in in May of last year. We've had two days of debate on the budget; two days, as compared with the normal debate of about 10 or 12 days on the budget. There have always been not less than five days, consecutive days, of budget debate. We had two days. The government has stopped us voting on the budget.

The parliamentary rules, as you know, Madam Speaker, allow for certain votes of non-confidence, and they are as follows: We have one vote of non-confidence after a throne speech is brought in, one after debate of the budget, and the official opposition party is allowed three motions of non-confidence per parliamentary session, which means as long as the government doesn't call an election or prorogue the House, and the third party is allowed two motions of censure which could lead to the dethroning of the government. This government is very careful to avoid at least one of them by simply not bringing any further debate on the budget.

I'm always struck by the name of this party that is in government, the New Democratic Party. It is indeed a new definition of democracy when you absolutely eliminate the rights of the opposition to express the feelings of the electorate.

This is a party which came to power and won a majority government with 37.8% of the vote. You may recall that is less of the popular vote than Frank Miller got, and these are the people who got together with the Liberals to throw the Conservatives out on a vote of non-confidence. They've got less of a mandate than Frank Miller had in terms of votes, but they have decided, no, the people should not have a right to be heard by limiting the amount of debate.

I see the member for Cambridge nodding his head, saying it's not true. Well, it is true. Two days of debate—

**Hon Mike Farnan (Minister without Portfolio in Education and Training):** On a point of privilege, Madam Speaker: I'm listening carefully to the member, as always, as he puts forth his views, and I do believe there is a misinterpretation here.

The fact of the matter is that he may question the government on issues, but surely he should not question the people of Ontario, who have given a legitimate mandate by electing a majority of New Democrats to represent this province in government, however it irks the opposition Conservatives. It is hard for them to accept the fact that this is a government legitimately elected by the population of Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker:** The privileges have not been violated. The member for York Mills.

**Mr Turnbull:** Obviously, I've hit a raw nerve. The fact is, you have allowed us two days of debate on the largest tax grab in this province's history, tax measures

which allow for \$3 billion in tax increases, and by the time you take out some tax increases which the Liberals brought in, it nets \$2 billion, theoretically. In three years of government from this party, we've had \$4 billion in net tax increases: \$4 billion.

And where are we today, Madam Speaker? I'll tell you where we are. They're bringing in \$2 billion less in revenue, because we've hit the tax wall. We are now the most heavily taxed administration in all of North America. If you don't think that has an implication for creating jobs for our children and the unemployed people of Ontario, then you must be smoking something funny, and I think you are inhaling.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Interjections are out of order. Would the member please address his remarks to the Chair.

**Mr Turnbull:** Madam Speaker, it's surprising that you say that after the way you handled somebody from your own party when they—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Turnbull:** Madam Speaker, we've had two days of debate. I am absolutely disgusted with this government. We have had three downgrades of this government's credit rating, and I believe that imminently we may have a fourth. Well, that would be their record: four years in office, four downgrades, because there is no doubt—

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** Spot on.

**Mr Turnbull:** I hear one of the members from the government babbling on about "Spot on." We remember when the Treasurer said that they were spot on. He was so spot on that his numbers were completely wrong and we had a downgrade. That's precisely what I'm talking about, that we had downgrades because they were so un-spot-on.

We talk about a \$16-billion potential deficit this year.

**Mr Fletcher:** Sit down.

**Mr Turnbull:** You can imagine any number: You tell the public it's going to be \$16 billion, and you come in at less than that. That's not fair. That's a shell game.

I hear some of the members saying, "Sit down." They don't like hearing the truth. I challenge each and every member of the government to refute any matter of fact that I have presented here today. Indeed, the Provincial Auditor doesn't like what the government is doing.

1650

What have we got here? We've got a government which is attacking jobs. We've got a government which is discouraging business to be in this province. We've got a government which is discouraging home ownership. The Toronto Home Builders' Association has estimated that the cost of these tax measures on constructing new homes is in the thousands. If that doesn't go to the heart of job creation, I don't know what does.

We've got an interesting new industry in Ontario called you-brew where you go and you brew yourself beer or wine, and this government is taxing what the people do as a hobby with their own materials. It was a

new industry. It was an industry that was creating jobs, badly needed jobs, and indeed I see today that Canadian you-brew companies are going to the US and setting up down there because it's a new concept there. We pioneered it, but it's moving to the US because this is an environment which is unfriendly to those businesses, and we'll lose those jobs.

This is the government which wants to increase taxes to the common people who make their own beer and wine, and yet goes to Chrysler in a year of record profits and forgives it a loan. Can you imagine a government which goes to one of the most profitable corporations in the world, in the automobile construction business, and says, "Don't worry about the fact that you're giving your chief executives and in fact all of your workers huge bonuses"—in some cases as much as one year's salary as a bonus—"we're going to forgive your loan"? That is not being fiscally responsible with the taxpayers' money.

Small businesses are suffering. I'll give you an example of how this tax measure affects small businesses.

One of my constituents, who owns Fuchs Watch Service—it's a two-person operation—has said that the warranty tax, the 8% retail sales tax on parts and labour, will directly attack him. He is the importer and distributor of Swiss watches.

When people buy Swiss watches, they pay for a warranty included in the price. Let's have no doubt about it: When you buy a product and it has a warranty, you've already included the cost of that in the price. It's very simple. So the people have already paid sales tax on that warranty, but this government says, "Wow, there's a new way that we can tax something," tax parts that have already, in effect, been taxed in the price of the new car, and in this case, my constituent, Mr Fuchs, said that he is having to pony up the retail sales tax when he services watches under warranty.

The Swiss manufacturer is not about to rebate him anything for this. He's just out of luck. He also notes that there is an additional burden, a paperwork burden, as a result of this, because there are yet more forms to fill out. His wife, who does all of the bookkeeping for the business, now takes days per month for all of the compliance of all of the different levels of government forms to be filled out and mailed, as opposed to hours when they first set up in business. That, my friends, is a direct attack on jobs.

Mr Fuchs is very concerned. He set up his business some 34 years ago. He's paid taxes and been a contributing member of society and now he's worried about his very existence because of measures that this government has taken—not just this government; it's successive governments and things that they have done. But you know the old saying about the straw that broke the camel's back. This government has been heaping a lot of straw on the camel lately, and we're concerned that maybe we have broken the camel's back.

We only have to look at what the government has done, piling up taxes on cigarettes, and then it had to retreat, along with the federal government, to a ridiculous extent. I would suggest that had they not increased taxes as much as they did, they would never have been in the



position that they had to reduce them as much as they have now, and now we've got a huge hole in revenues because the tax on cigarettes has been rolled back. Well, my friends, you're to blame, because you didn't see that you were coming up to the tax wall.

In the time since 1985, when the Liberals and then the New Democrats have been in power, we've had a 53.5% gain in income. The average person in this province has increased their income by that amount, but taxes have gone up by 73.4%. The tax burden has increased by almost 50% over the rate at which incomes have gone up. If people think things are hard to get, to make ends meet today, it's because taxes are 50% higher than they were in 1985 when Ontario was competitive, had an advantage over many provinces. But we're not competitive any more and as a result we are losing jobs, and jobs are the most precious item we can offer to the people who are out of work and the young people who are coming up through the schooling system, because we don't want to see them having to go to the US or other provinces to get jobs. We want them to stay here and enjoy the wonderful province we've got, that we've been privileged to enjoy.

This government has taken away the commercial concentration tax, that much-hated and reviled tax that the Liberals brought in. They've also taken away the tire tax, which the Liberals sold to us by saying they were going to use the money for recycling and research on recycling. I wonder if you happen to know the number—I do—of how much they spent on recycling. One percent of the revenue they got on that huge tax grab, which disappeared into general revenue, found its way into any recycling project at all. It was a complete failure. It was just a tax grab.

This is the reason the government of today is in so much difficulty. It isn't just the actions of this government; to a great extent it's the actions of the previous government, which increased the size of the civil service at a time when businesses were flattening out the pyramid, and increased debt and increased taxes, not a good combination and certainly not a combination which leads to the creation of jobs.

The impact of auto insurance is quite interesting. Here we have a government that always used to campaign on bringing in government-run auto insurance.

**Mr Stockwell:** Government what?

**Mr Turnbull:** Government-run auto insurance. Do you remember that? The Agenda for People. I remember them talking about this for years, how they were going to reduce the tax burden, they were going to reduce the cost of automobile insurance. And here's a government that not only has failed to reduce the cost of automobile insurance but is now taxing it so that people who need their automobile to go to work are paying 5% of the premium to this government. For what? For nothing, because they're not getting value.

This is the government that is doing everything to make us uncompetitive, and it has succeeded. In 1985, taxes were 8.8% of our GDP. Today, after Liberal and NDP governments, they're 11.2% of GDP. That is a burden we're going to bear for a long time, because not only have we increased taxes but we've increased debt.

In the time since this government has been in power, it has doubled the amount of debt this province has, in just three and a half years doubled the debt, the accumulated debt we've got since Confederation. I can't think of a worse indictment. One doesn't have to shout and scream. You can just very quietly say they have doubled the debt in three and a half years.

**1700**

In fairness to them, this has been an awful recession, the worst recession we have known since the 1930s. And yes, welfare costs have gone up, but not all of the welfare costs have been as a result of people being out of work. They have increased the benefits. They have stopped home visits to ensure that those people who are claiming welfare are in fact unemployed, to check out their circumstances and that they qualify for welfare. You may recall that the Liberals stopped the spouse-in-the-house requirement, so if somebody is living common-law with a wage earner, no matter how much money they get, that person can claim welfare. That is one of the significant reasons that welfare has gone up substantially.

I'm separating that out from the quite legitimate increase in welfare as a result of people being laid off and not having jobs. We should be able to respond and help many of those people who legitimately don't have jobs. I suspect we need to give them more help, but we can't because this profligate government has spent money in every other area.

I know it's a trivial matter, but I always remind the government, when I'm talking about the way it spends money, of the fact that it gave \$50,000 to unions to create a new union song. Come on, get serious. Fifty thousand dollars to create a new union song? Let the unions pay for it themselves. How dare you spend taxpayers' money that way?

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** Through the roof.

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** Anybody have any Valium? Any Valium in the House?

**Mr Turnbull:** I see I've woken up some of the parishioners over there who spent \$50,000 of taxpayers' money on creating a new union song. How many jobs did that create? They spent \$20,000 on sending a group of union activists away to a humour school. Gosh, I'll bet that created some jobs.

I don't care what party you belong to, you've got to start waking up to the fact that the people of Ontario are suffering. We are losing jobs because of measures of government. Businesses have become a lot more efficient, and we can be viable in this province, we can be very competitive because we have certain advantages, but governments have taken away any advantages we have.

If you take out of the equation the amount that taxes have risen and fees by government agencies at the federal, provincial and municipal level, we haven't had any inflation. We've probably had deflation over the last few years. There is the problem. All levels of government, of all political stripes, are not coming to grips with the fundamental problem we have, that governments have gotten too large and are doing too many things.

Many of the people who truly need help from government are falling through the cracks because they don't quite fit in this program or that program. Then there's another group of people who are merrily ripping off the system.

We have health cards which, when seniors reach 65, they can trot down to Buffalo and sell, because we're not demanding that the old health card be handed back at the time we give them the new health card. I am told by some doctors that they believe the going rate is \$3,000 for an illegal Ontario health card, which the person doesn't need any longer because they've just got their senior's health card.

These are practical ways we can address this problem so that the taxpayer can save some money and then you don't need to take these tax measures.

But hear me and hear me good: We have to allow the opposition parties to express openly and fairly the concerns of the rest of the people over and above that 37.8% who voted for the present government. This government has changed the House rules so we can't have any of the bell-ringing. Remember the bell-ringing that occurred in the previous government's time in office? We can't do that. We're limited in our debate. We're limited in all of our parliamentary manoeuvres.

I can tell you when these people are in opposition after this next government, and there won't be many of them, they are not going to have anything to say if either of the opposition parties cut them off on debate, because they don't deserve any debate because they've done it to us. They don't allow us a proper debate of the most important aspect which drives our government: the gathering of revenue, which impacts all of job creation in this province.

Just to wrap this up, I want to say that we've had a very serious impact on jobs as a result of the tax on auto insurance premiums of 5%. We've probably impacted the cost of new housing by as much as \$10,000 per house as a result of the tax on sand and gravel and clay and soil and unfinished stone, because it goes into the aggregates and the sands and everything that goes into making the concrete, the cement, and we have hit a small but interesting new business, the you-brew business. We're allowing people to you-brew at home, but as soon as they go out of their house and use some equipment that they rent, "Oh, oh, let's tax them."

This government has put a tax on the parts and labour component of warranties, a sales tax, when the people have already paid the tax on it in the new price of the product, and at the same time this government has gone to Chrysler, the most profitable automobile manufacturer in North America, and in a year when it has given bonuses of up to 100% of salaries, they've said, "We're going to forgive you the loan that we gave you." I forget the number but it was—

**Mr Stockwell:** Seven million.

**Mr Turnbull:** Seven million, my colleague says. Why do you do that? Why do you do that? It's very interesting that where this government spends money is always in a union outfit. Why do they do that? Is it payoff time? This

same government has just sold the GO rolling stock and it's leasing it back, and they've sold it so that the deal closed in Bermuda. I wonder why. Could it be something to do with a tax angle? A tax angle.

This government, this is the NDP that always used to roil against corporate welfare bums, companies that legitimately were using the existing tax structure to order their affairs so that they paid the least amount of taxes so they would have money to pay their shareholders and their employees and reinvest in the business. But this is the government that says: "That's bad, unless you happen to be a unionized outfit. Then we'll give you money, we'll forgive you loans, and as well as that, we're going to use the same tax structures. We'll use them ourselves in sale and leaseback."

I can tell you that in the commercial real estate business, almost invariably when companies started to sell their assets and lease them back, it was a dead giveaway that they were in deep financial trouble and the end was nigh. I can tell you that the people who bought those sale and leasebacks really took big risks and often blew their brains out as a result of it, and they were not highly attractive propositions. Often they wanted all kinds of other guarantees. The guarantee, unfortunately, is the taxpayer of Ontario, who is saying: "Don't tax me any more. Otherwise, I'm going to leave." We're losing jobs because of this government's action.

They can have all of the rhetoric they want, but the fact is that they are attacking the small and medium-sized business sector, and that is the sector which creates jobs, not the large corporations which are unionized that these people are trotting down and forgiving loans to.

1710

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions or comments to the member for York Mills?

**Mr Stephen Owens (Scarborough Centre):** I sat and listened carefully to most of the member's comments with respect to Bill 134, and I find it very interesting actually—

**Mr O'Connor:** Bill 138.

**Mr Owens:** Sorry, 138 my colleague tells me—that the party federally that brought us the goods and services tax—a small business person I saw in the newspaper, and you probably did as well, Madam Speaker, was showing receipts where the small business owner had to turn down \$45,000 in sales because the purchases had been voided because the purchasers had refused to pay the Tory-induced, Tory-rammed-through goods and services tax. So I find it a little bit difficult to listen to this member of the third party talk about the NDP and taxes, particularly sales tax.

I find it particularly difficult to listen to this party when one of their former treasurers, Frank Miller, who went on to become Premier for a short period of time, put the provincial sales tax on feminine hygiene products for women, thinking that this is an option for women and it doesn't matter that you add another percentage, that they can make the choice between either using the product or not.

Again the member is not quite on base when he talks



about this government destroying jobs and sending capital fleeing from this province.

**Mr Stockwell:** I suppose after a while you get used to a government member standing up talking about a lot of jurisdictions and legislators who had nothing to do with what we're talking about today. I suppose after a while you get used to a government that simply, on any issue that it has to deal with, blames somebody else, be it the federal government, be it us, be it the Liberals in opposition.

I suppose you're supposed to get used to it, but it's just incredible to think that the member from Scarborough would stand in this House today speaking about a tax bill and then talk about the GST and talk about taxes instituted 10 years ago by a Conservative government on feminine hygiene products for women.

It makes me wonder: Is there nothing that this member can't speak to with respect to the piece of legislation before us? The sad indictment is that it's absolutely pathetic to look at the defence offered by the member for Scarborough Centre. It's painful to see this member stand up, not even defending the tax, not defending his government, talking about Brian Mulroney and Frank Miller.

This member as well as this government have to jump-start themselves into the 1990s. We've long since left the 1980s, and I feel for these people, because they're going to get back to the electorate, and the electorate isn't talking about Brian Mulroney any more. The electorate isn't talking about Frank Miller. The electorate's talking about Bob Rae and Floyd Laughren, and they're not even talking about Steve Owens in his own riding. Frankly, they don't even know who Steve Owens is. They're talking about Bob Rae and they're talking about Floyd Laughren.

When we talk about this in the future, I'd ask you, I beg you, deal with the issues. Deal with your new tax. Explain them. Tell us why they're good. The member for York Mills was sensational. I think it was a great speech he gave, and I was expecting somebody on the other side to stand up and defend him. You are pathetic.

**Mr O'Connor:** As I sat here and listened to the member complain about not having an ability to speak on a budget item—he said that—here we are, we're talking about a tax bill that's part of the budget bill. He's speaking on the budget bills because this is part of this, and I bet you he stood in his place, oh, I don't know, half a dozen times anyway, and spoke about it. Then he talks about driving business out of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, I want to tell you a little bit of good news, because we never talk about enough good news in here. Last week, as the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health I had the opportunity to go to Etobicoke, Engineering Fibre Optic Systems; EFOS, they call themselves. It's a growing little company that has decided to invest in Ontario—yes, Bob Rae's Ontario—in Canada; 90% of their business is abroad; high-tech jobs, and their employees are growing all the time. In fact, the reason their jobs are even growing is because they're getting recognized that as employers they can add through Jobs Ontario.

This Bob Rae Ontario government, for the first time ever, recognizes that it costs money to train people. We've created Jobs Ontario. They complained about it, they wanted to scrap it, yet here we've got a growing company, John Kennedy and Glen Harvey from EFOS, who are part of the whole economic development that is happening even within the Ministry of Health. They are increasing their workplace, they're investing in Ontario, and the opposition complains.

Every once in a while you've got to speak positively about something. They don't know how to do that. Jobs are coming here. Let's talk about something positive for a change and let's get off this here where you don't have a chance to speak.

**Hon Mr Farnan:** I've heard the honourable member for York Mills speak in this House on innumerable occasions and it strikes me that this member has a problem. The problem is that the people of Ontario actually elected a progressive, effective New Democratic government in the 1990 election. Much as he wants to deny the fact, much as it disturbs him, the reality of the matter is that the people went to the polls, they voted democratically and indeed, a majority of members—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** A point of order, the member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'd like to rise on a point of order, much the same as the point of order that the member himself spoke of when he rose on a point of order to the comments that were made by the member for York Mills. I rise on the same point of order. The member for Cambridge made the point of order at the time that there was a 37.8% total vote for the members of the government side—

**The Speaker:** The member does not have a point of order. The member for Cambridge.

**Hon Mr Farnan:** Mr Speaker, I would note that the clock has been running through this and I would appreciate your judgement in this.

Let me put it this way: In the past there have been Progressive Conservative governments elected with less than 50% of the vote in the province of Ontario and in those days they were indeed, some of those governments, mildly progressive, not like the Conservatives we have in Ontario at this moment in time, who are so far to the right that they embarrass Attila the Hun.

The reality of the matter is that we have a progressive government, democratically elected with a majority in the province, and we are doing an effective job.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for York Mills has up to two minutes for his reply.

**Mr Turnbull:** I wish I had more than two minutes. The fact is, there wasn't one single member of the government who rose to defend this budget measure. The points that I made in terms of attacking jobs, all they talked about is how they were creating jobs, but the fact was, they didn't respond in any way to the job losses which are associated with these tax measures. The fact is, the best they can manage is talking about a federal government and blaming them and somehow trying to equate them with us.

I can tell you, my friends, the former federal members of the NDP certainly didn't want to talk about your efforts, and in fact, Steven Langdon was more than not wanting to; he said you were wrong in what you were doing. This government cannot defend its own measures. All they can do is blame somebody else.

You know, Harry Truman had a sign on his desk and it said, "The buck stops here." I think Bob Rae must have a sign on his desk saying, "The buck stops somewhere else," because they have never accepted any responsibility for what they are doing.

1720

There was some nonsense about feminine hygiene products being taxed.

#### *Interjections.*

**Mr Turnbull:** Of course it was wrong, in the same way, my friend, that it's wrong to tax auto insurance. You talk about feminine hygiene products being optional; of course they weren't. Neither is auto insurance. You go to jail if you don't have auto insurance. Wake up. This is a job-killing bill.

But I spoke about the fact that they have given us only two days of debate of the main budget and have never allowed us to vote on it, and that is wrong.

**The Speaker:** Is there further debate on this bill?

**Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin):** I'm particularly pleased to have an opportunity to stand in the House to discuss Bill 138. One of the things that strikes me immediately is that the taxes that we're talking about in this bill have been occurring through this province for some time now; as a matter of fact, about a year, roughly.

When you think about that, I'm slightly offended that we haven't had an opportunity as legislators, as people in the Legislature, to speak to a bill that has affected my constituents in a rather dramatic fashion. I hope that in the few minutes I have to speak I can talk a little bit about Algoma-Manitoulin and how this particular bill affects those people whom I represent and indeed those people in northern Ontario. Perhaps I might even mention a little bit about how it affects all of Ontario.

First, after having heard some of the debate to date, I should remind members what we are actually talking about. What this bill actually does is it allows a sales tax on metered parking, it has provisions to tax brew-your-own establishments and it changes insurance premiums to taxable for retail sales tax purposes.

In the fine riding of Algoma-Manitoulin we are not terribly concerned about taxes on parking meters. We do not, to my knowledge, have parking meters. We might wish we did, but that particular tax does not mean an incredible amount of money to the people I represent, although when they go to Sudbury or maybe to Sault Ste Marie or maybe even visit the fine metropolis of Toronto, they might be somewhat annoyed by knowing that now even parking is being taxed. But in Elliot Lake, in Espanola and certainly in Mindemoya this is not one of those tax grabs that is going to annoy them greatly.

The brew-your-own, which is the second change here, is one of the strangest taxes I think I can probably consider, and my constituents would probably find this

one to be a very, very curious tax, because it's a tax on small business people. Across the north there are a number of brew-your-own establishments. They are not owned by big conglomerates; they're owned by individual people trying to make a living in the face of what could be said is probably depression in the north rather than recession. They were doing modestly well until Mr Laughren decided that taxes on the products would be imposed. As you've heard from other speakers, the tax has changed the dynamics of this business incredibly.

Small businesses that were making at least marginal profits, were returning a little bit of money to the pockets of their owners, were providing some jobs, are now going out of business. We know they can't stay in business. And for what? I cannot imagine that the amount of revenue coming from these particular brew-your-own establishments is significant to the province of Ontario.

I understand, and I think all members understand, and I'm certain that my constituents understand, that governments have to tax. If we're going to provide services, we must have money. But to put people out of business for very little money is something I find a very curious statement on the part of the government. It's certainly a very anti-small-business statement. It is a statement that says, "Regardless of what revenue we are going to get, we're going to put you out of business." That, to me, doesn't make sense.

Now we come to the third part of Bill 138, that does affect my constituents and affects them dramatically and directly. That is the tax on auto insurance premiums, on household insurance premiums or insurance premiums for group insurance, on a great number of—

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Considering how we're interested in how this tax affects the people in the member's riding, I think there should be a quorum to hear it.

**The Speaker:** Could the table officer determine whether a quorum is present.

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Algoma-Manitoulin may resume.

**Mr Brown:** I want to talk a little about auto insurance taxation. I want to remind members that this is not the first increase in taxes on auto insurance since this government came to power. As a matter of fact, the government imposed, I believe in the 1991 budget, a 3% hidden tax on automobile insurance premiums. So we start with 3% and now we add 5%, making—

**Mr Stockwell:** Eight per cent.

**Mr Brown:** Thank you, Mr Stockwell—8% tax on automobile insurance premiums. I was one of those who ran in the 1990 election, and I listened to New Democrats talk about auto insurance and the ripoff of the big insurance companies and the ripoff of the OMPP, how this was destroying people's ability in my riding to drive their cars to work, to partake in all the activities that a



normal family partakes in, because there isn't mass transit in my riding, with the exception of the fine city of Elliot Lake. In the rest of the riding, if you're going to go to work, if you're going to partake in recreational activities, if you're going to go to church, you're going to have to have a vehicle. It isn't an option. It isn't something you can choose. If you're going to get there, you have to have a vehicle.

New Democrats in 1990 talked a lot about reducing automobile insurance premiums through something called public auto insurance. But we know what happened to public auto insurance. The reason, I take it, that public auto insurance was never put before the people of Ontario as legislation was the very fact that it would cost more, not less, and that therefore it shouldn't happen. But then the government decided to impose a tax, to impose a tax of 3%, to increase the rate artificially by 3% through a tax grab. That one was hidden. Then they come along and introduce Bill 164, a bill that has increased insurance rates throughout my constituency dramatically. Then they impose a retail sales tax of 5%.

This is from New Democrats, from people in this province who promised the people who voted for them that there would be a better auto insurance system in Ontario, that the rates would be lower. The people in a riding like Algoma-Manitoulin, which is very large, depend on personal vehicles to go from one place to another. Their costs have now increased dramatically.

I think I know what the people in Algoma-Manitoulin will think about the NDP policy on auto insurance, a policy that has increased premiums by 20% to 25% over what they said were unconscionably high rates in 1990. I think I know what they're going to think. I think I know what my constituents will think about a party that goes out and says: "We're about lower insurance rates. We know you have to get to work, we know you have to have a vehicle. We know that's part of the northern experience. Therefore, we're going to do something about it." What they didn't tell people was they were going to increase the cost of that very same insurance by 25%.

1730

That's maybe bad enough, but when you consider that in a previous budget this government decided it would increase gasoline taxes by 30%—it increased gasoline taxes by 30%—you have to wonder about the commitment it made in 1990 to the people in my constituency, certainly to the people of northern Ontario, and of course to the whole province.

We find these kinds of regressive taxes on a lifestyle we must maintain. We can't get on the TTC. It isn't there. We pay for the TTC, like all Ontarians do, through our taxes, but we can't use the subway. I was hoping the constituents could at some point maybe go from Providence Bay to Mindemoya on a subway, but I think that would be a little expensive and hard to sell to any Treasurer of the province.

This particular measure being debated about nine months after it took effect is passing strange. We're standing here in this place right now scratching our heads and saying, "Why would a government do this?" I have to give the Minister of Finance some credit for being

somewhat astute in 1993 when he presented his budget. He seemed to understand that Ontarians were hitting the wall about taxes, that there was a growing underground economy. I would suggest to you that this is one reason he introduced a tax on automobile insurance premiums. He knew they would be collected. That's the beauty of this. He knew there was no way of avoiding paying a retail sales tax, because some insurance company, some insurance broker, has to collect it at some point and send it to him. It's not something you can do underground, unless you choose not to insure your car.

At least in some ways the Treasurer back then understood that the tax wall had been reached, that people would not pay more taxes for less services, and if there's anything this government's been about, it's pay more and get less. He used this rather interesting vehicle to get at your pocketbook because you can't avoid paying it. You pay 25% more, at least, than you did in 1990 for automobile insurance because of the very measures this government has taken.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: They are really interesting points the member makes, and there should be quorum to hear them.

**The Speaker:** Would the table officer determine whether a quorum is present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Algoma-Manitoulin may resume his speech.

**Mr Brown:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, I always enjoy seeing my colleagues come out for one of my efforts in the House.

As I was saying when I was interrupted, the automobile insurance premium tax is hurting the constituents in Killarney. It's hurting my constituents in Meldrum Bay. It's a real problem for the many seniors in my area. We have seniors who are actually moving to our area in great numbers, because what we have is a bountiful amount of very good housing and, as you know, the city of Elliot Lake has encouraged many seniors to come.

But one of the realities of seniors is that they have fixed incomes, and one of the realities is that in most cases they need and want their cars, and one of the realities is that they have difficulty paying increased premiums to the Minister of Finance of this government.

I think the seniors of this province, and particularly in an area like the one I represent, are going to have great difficulty and are having great difficulty, because they tell me so through writing, phoning my office, coming in to see me, stopping me on the street.

They're concerned about this tax grab by a government that it seems they can do nothing about and have great difficulty understanding how it adds up with the promises of this particular political party that is now governing the province of Ontario that were made to them in 1990 in the famous, or infamous, Agenda for People. I think they're going to find that really quite strange.

The other problem with this tax on insurance moves into the group insurance area, where people now have to pay tax on the premiums on their group health insurance. If you have health insurance through your company, guess what? The government is now taxing you.

I have a sister who works for the federal government. She was quite surprised that, gee, in her paycheque there was a large deduction for Bob Rae's tax on her group insurance. The federal government, for whatever reason, had not got into the system early, and they had to pay a lump sum payment.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think we should hear more about his sister and there should be a quorum to hear it.

**The Speaker:** Would the table officer determine if a quorum is present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Algoma-Manitoulin may resume his speech.

**Mr Brown:** I was talking about group insurance and the effect premium increases are having, and there are premium increases. Certainly if you talk to anybody who's in a labour union, anybody who's a manager, anybody who owns a business, one of the great problems they have today is controlling benefit costs, benefit premiums, in order to make sure the people in the workplace have the effective and proper amount of benefit coverage.

It's getting increasingly difficult for employers and employees to negotiate good benefit plans, and one of the reasons is the increased pressure on the system. Now, on top of the increased pressure on the system—which we know is happening anyway; that's going on—a government imposes unilaterally an 8% tax.

Mr Speaker, what do you think is going to happen? I know what I think is going to happen. I think companies are going to have a very difficult time in providing the benefits to their employees at the level they are providing them at today. I don't think there's any question about that, and I think adding an artificial 8% cost to these premiums will mean less benefits.

1740

If I'm the union steward, if I'm the union negotiator going to see the company, I don't think I appreciate the fact that the company's bill for insurance for me and my colleagues has gone up artificially 8% and the company somehow has to absorb that. I think when I go in to bargain, I would like to get some better benefits and I think this just makes it more difficult for both labour and management to be able to provide the kinds of benefits that most members in this Legislature would expect people to have. That's what it does.

There seems to be a trend, and this bill informs it. The trend is to get revenue where it usually can't be seen. Who knows that group insurance premiums are being

taxed, unless you get a bill? I know some superannuated teachers are upset, I know various groups of retirees are upset about this, but most people don't know. So it seems like a good place to get revenue.

When you put this kind of sneaky tax into place, you're grabbing money without people being able to say: "Yes, that's what it's about. I understand I'm getting this benefit and that this is the tax I have to pay for it." What they're really saying with this is: "We've got to hide it. We've got to collect it through means that people don't really see it coming out of their pocketbook directly or we won't get it."

In the very same budget that this bill comes from, we also know there's over \$200 million of fee increases, increases to things like Outdoors cards and moose licences and you name it: increases in fees that people have to pay.

In my role as critic of the Ministry of Natural Resources I have seen a huge increase in the amount that companies and individuals have to pay to harvest our crown forests. Mr Speaker, you'd be surprised to know, I'm sure, that the area charges for forest companies have doubled in the last year and that the stumpage fees have gone up dramatically. We're about to find out that they're going to increase \$2.50 or \$3 more very shortly.

It comes to a point where somebody has to say: "Are the rates in Ontario competitive? Is the taxation that we are levying, whether it be by fees or whether it be by kind of insidious measures like this retail sales tax grab, providing value to the people of Ontario?" Because taxation is really about value. People don't mind paying taxes. Nobody really likes it, but they don't mind if they see that there's value.

For the last four years we have seen, I believe, overall, a tax increase in the province of Ontario of about 12%, we have seen and will see about a doubling of the accumulated debt of this province and we will see a dramatic decrease in the amount of services that people are getting for the tax dollars they're paying. It's about value. People are willing to pay taxes if there is value.

I think on behalf of my constituents in Algoma-Manitoulin, I can fairly say they don't believe the decrease in hospital beds at St Joe's in Elliot Lake, the cutting of services at the Manitoulin Health Centre, a decrease in our ambulance service, problems with seniors' programs, especially the drug benefit program, and many others—they don't see those as increases in service. I don't think many members of this House will either.

I would suggest to you that any tax measure has to be evaluated on its value, on value for money, on that kind of very reasonable and rational approach. The people in my constituency are seeing less and less and it's costing them more and more. I don't believe that they would ask me, as the person who represents them, to support a tax grab as large as this one.

We talk about tax grabs, and I believe that this is the largest tax grab in Ontario's history. The second one happened in 1984, under the Miller government, as good as my friends over here in the third party are at avoiding that issue.



The fact is that the increase in taxation is not just something that this government has done. The taxes in this province have been raised by all three political parties, and they've been raised because we are providing increased services—or should only be raised if there are increased services, increased value to the people of Ontario. The fact is that by any stretch of the imagination, this government has failed that test.

My constituents would instruct me to not support the government's budgetary policy, they would instruct me to vote against Bill 138, and they would instruct me to do everything in my power to bring about an election if that is at all in the cards, and I want to tell my constituents that I will do my best to accomplish all three of those.

**The Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for Algoma-Manitoulin for his contribution to the debate and invite any questions and/or comments. Is there further debate on this bill?

**Mr Stockwell:** I guess the dilemma faced by the government at this time is trying to defend year-old or two-year-old tax measures to the general public. There's clearly no segment of the population out there, no broadly based segment of the population, that in fact would support—

**Mr Brown:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe there's a quorum present.

**The Speaker:** Would the table officer determine if a quorum is present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Etobicoke West may resume his debate.

**Mr Stockwell:** I would like to thank the member for Algoma-Manitoulin for ensuring that the proper numbers in the House are in fact here so we can carry on the business that the government deems necessary for the people in this province. I would add that the government members are responsible to keep a quorum. In case the viewing public doesn't know, they've done a rather poor job today. They would receive failing grades on ensuring 20 of their members are actively aware of what's going on in the Legislature today.

**Hon Allan Pilkey (Minister without Portfolio in Municipal Affairs):** Your caucus wouldn't even listen to you. They've all gone home.

**Mr Stockwell:** I see the ex-minister of Solicitor General, and I forget how many ex-ministers he was—

**Mr Pilkey:** There isn't a single one. You're babbling on incessantly with no support from your caucus.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Stockwell:** A junior minister from Oshawa who gets a car. Actually, a junior minister's job isn't too bad when you think about it. You get the car, you get more money but you don't have any responsibility. That's kind of a great thought. You wouldn't have to spend your time at the cabinet table, but you get to run out to your car

and go to McDonald's for lunch any time you want.

So having noted that interesting sidebar, it's rather interesting that this government, which often talked about previous legislators and previous governments—

**Mrs Sullivan:** Number 6.

**Mr Stockwell:** Number 6, right—and the regressiveness with which previous governments implemented tax hikes. We could argue long and hard about the tax hikes, and clearly this government thinks they're warranted.

1750

What I find the most interesting is the places they decided to increase the taxes. When in opposition, this government often spoke about regressive taxes. Their definition of a regressive tax was based not on ability to pay. A tax that was based on ability to pay was a progressive tax, a tax that the socialists could buy into. The Treasurer himself was often a speaker of this.

A regressive tax was one that was solely based on purchasing, particularly on items that all people needed to purchase, and therefore everyone was charged the same amount of money or same portion of tax. That became a regressive tax because it wasn't based on the ability to pay; it was simply based on a broad sector of the economy.

It's curious, having recalled those heady days when in opposition Bob Rae would often stand and talk about regressive taxes and how they were the terrible things that made the poor poorer and the wealthy wealthier and those kinds of regressive tax were something that he would never stand for and he didn't believe in, and that kind of terrible stuff would never happen under a socialist in Ontario.

We sit here today—I stand—and we talk about the taxes that have been implemented by this government, particularly as part of this bill, Bill 138. It's funny, you know, because every tax that you deal with in this act is what Mr Bob Rae, QC, would've classified as a regressive tax. Think about it.

Insurance on your car: Why is that a regressive tax? Because if you own a car, you have to have insurance. The law says you have to have insurance to drive your car. So everybody who owns a car, as wealthy as you may be and as a working poor person who's just getting to work and back to keep your job, or a farmer or a person in northern Ontario where there isn't public transportation or people in rural settings where they don't have the ways and means to get around, they have to buy a car or a truck. So what is this tax classified as? A regressive tax.

Son of a gun, it's a socialist standing up and saying, "Let's put forward a regressive tax on insurance," insurance, by law, that we say you must have, and tax them across the board.

**Mr Perruzza:** Here comes Bob. Hey, Bob.

**Mr Stockwell:** This may be difficult for the member for Downsview to take in. I suggest he take Hansard home, reread it tonight, and he'll catch on. Regressive tax is something he doesn't believe in. Regressive tax, I know the member for Fort York doesn't believe in

because I remember the regressive tax issue with the market value assessment, and I remember the positions put forward by those people on the other side of the House, how municipal taxes were a regressive tax. It wasn't based on ability to pay, and it should be done away with. Well, market value assessment got in the way and all that terrible stuff. They never rectified that problem.

But insurance, got to have insurance on your car, got to have it on your car in any part of this province, and this government slapped a provincial sales tax on insurance that did not exist before.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Stockwell:** The Minister of Agriculture should know this because this is a concern brought forward by many of the farming community in Ontario. Many of the farming community said: "I need these vehicles. These are part of my job. These help run my farm." And he's saying, "No matter how wealthy you are, no matter how you can afford it, you pay that provincial tax on the insurance."

Gosh, you'd think it wasn't a socialist in power any more, but my eyes don't fool me; it is.

**Warranty tax:** Here's a good one. Floyd was sitting around one day and he was saying, "Where can I go to find more tax?" One of the mandarins in the back office in the dark room somewhere got a bright idea, scratching his head, and said, "Why don't we tax warranties?"

You see, I remember the days when warranties really were free. "This is a free warranty." Well, it wasn't really free. We all knew full well a warranty was something you paid for in the price of the purchase you're making, so the warranty price is built in.

If you bought a toaster or a blender or a car, they provided you with a warranty. You knew the manufacturer had built into the price a cost component to take care of that warranty, but Floyd's mandarin who got the bright idea, got Floyd's ear one day, and he said: "Boy, they won't figure this out. You just tax the warranty. So if they ever come back in to fix that item that used to be what they thought was free, we'll tax them." So Floyd decided to tax a warranty.

It seems to me that if the price of that warranty is built into the product or commodity you're purchasing, this in fact becomes a double tax. Also, it becomes a regressive tax, because warranties on cars are on all cars now, from the smallest to the largest, from the most expensive to the most inexpensive.

So we have here another example of socialist Ontario: another regressive tax contained in Bill 138. You'd think that wouldn't be the case. You'd think that socialists would not want to implement regressive taxes that penalize not just the wealthy but a broad cross-section of the community, regardless of how much money you make. You'd think socialists used to believe in that. They did, but on the way across the floor they got bonked on the head and they forgot all kinds of things.

What else did they forget? Well, here's an interesting one. This is even better, because this is not just a regressive tax, this is a tax on the less affluent, let's say—I

don't like saying a tax on the poor; this is a tax on the less affluent—because they decided one day that people who were operating brew-your-own operations weren't paying enough tax.

Why? Well, we all know why. The big unions got together at the big breweries and came into Floyd's office and said: "Mr Floyd, we've got a problem here. You're taxing us to death to such a degree, and the taxes we are paying on beer are creating a marketplace where we have to sell our beer for  $x$ , and somebody can go out and open a brew-your-own and sell it for something significantly less than  $x$ ."

Who are the people who were using those brew-your-own establishments? Lo and behold, this is worse than a regressive tax, because I'll say this: People making oodles of money and the wealthy probably weren't going to brew-your-own. I don't have statistics, but I would bet that the person who went to brew-your-own was the guy, probably a man, who went to this store because he wanted to avoid the oppressive, obnoxious, overbearing, overregulated taxes when he bought a case of beer.

Think about it. They went in to buy a case of beer and it was \$31, \$32, whatever it came to. Then they'd go to a brew-your-own establishment and pay something significantly less because they couldn't afford to pay the price for that case at the beer store. So who do Bob and Floyd and the mandarins put their heads together and hammer? Not the wealthy, not even the upper middle class: the poor guy who's trying to eke out a living. He thinks with the toil and sweat of his own hard work he would brew his own beer, take it home and while the hockey game was on, have a drink of beer, and no, he's not paying this enormous amount of taxes. But Bob and Floyd got him.

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: He's in full flight. The fact is that he's saying some rather important things and I don't think there's a quorum here to listen to him.

**The Speaker:** Would the table officer determine if a quorum is present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Etobicoke West may resume his speech.

**Mr Stockwell:** Bob and Floyd got together and said: "How are we going to hammer these working-poor people who, with the sweat and toil of their brows, would go out and brew their own beer and get away with not paying our taxes? How are we going to get those guys?"

Floyd decided, "We'll get them; we'll just tax the brew-your-own." So they're not taxing the beer, they're not taxing the purchase; they're taxing the sweat off their brows. They're taxing hard work. They're taxing a Saturday morning that you get up and go out and brew your own beer, working hard, sweating and doing it. Floyd says, "We're going to tax the sweat off this man's brow."



Is nothing sacred? No longer can you just go out, work hard and toil. Now they'll go into your back gardens, count how many vegetables you've grown and start slapping a tax on the vegetables grown in the backyards of Metropolitan Toronto. Is there no level this government—

**Mr Perruzza:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Given that there is only one Liberal and two Conservatives, I don't believe there's a quorum in the House.

**The Speaker:** Would you determine if a quorum is present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** There is a quorum present.

**The Speaker:** We've determined that a quorum is present. There is a quorum present. The member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Stockwell:** You know, Mr Speaker, it just is

poetic justice that this guy could stand up and have his shoe fall out of his mouth. Here he goes again.

**Mr Perruzza:** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I've just counted. Given that there's only one Liberal and two Conservatives, I don't believe there's a quorum in the House.

**The Speaker:** Could the table officer determine if a quorum is present.

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Speaker:** It now being past 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 10 of the clock tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 1802.

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Administration of justice/Administration de la justice**

Chair/Président: Rosario Marchese  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Margaret H. Harrington  
Zanana L. Akande, Gilles Bisson, Robert Chiarelli,  
Alvin Curling, Christel Haeck, Charles Harnick,  
Gary Malkowski, Tim Murphy, David Tilson,  
David Winninger  
Clerk/Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Estimates/Budgets des dépenses**

Chair/Président: Cameron Jackson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ted Arnott  
Donald Abel, Gary Carr, Noel Duignan, Murray J. Elston,  
Derek Fletcher, Pat Hayes, Wayne Lessard,  
Steven W. Mahoney, David Ramsay, Jim Wiseman  
Clerk/Greffier: Tonia Grannum

**Finance and economic affairs/**

**Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair/Président: Paul R. Johnson  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Jim Wiseman  
Elinor Caplan, Gary Carr, W. Donald Cousens,  
Karen Haslam, Norm Jamison, Monte Kwinter,  
Wayne Lessard, Irene Mathysen, Gerry Phillips,  
Kimble Sutherland  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**General government/Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair/Président: Michael A. Brown  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Hans Daigeler  
Ted Arnott, George Dadamo, Bernard Grandmaître,  
David Johnson, George Mammoliti, Gordon Mills,  
Mark Morrow, Gregory S. Sorbara, Paul Wessenger,  
Drummond White  
Clerk/Greffier: Franco Carrozza

**Government agencies/Organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair/Présidente: Margaret Marland  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Allan K. McLean  
James J. Bradley, Jenny Carter, John C. Cleary,  
Alvin Curling, Robert Frankford, Margaret H. Harrington,  
Gary Malkowski, George Mammoliti, Daniel Waters,  
Elizabeth Witmer  
Clerk/Greffière: Lynn Mellor

**Legislative Assembly/Assemblée législative**

Chair/Président: Ron Hansen  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Paul Wessenger  
George Dadamo, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon,  
Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin,  
Norman W. Sterling, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland,  
Noble Villeneuve  
Clerk/Greffière: Lisa Freedman

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month.

**Ombudsman**

Chair/Président: Tony Rizzo  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Gary Wilson  
Donald Abel, Zanana L. Akande, Mike Cooper,  
Karen Haslam, D. James Henderson, Tony Martin,  
Frank Miclash, Bill Murdoch, David Ramsay,  
Chris Stockwell  
Clerk/Greffier: Todd Decker

**Public accounts/Comptes publics**

Chair/Président: Joseph Cordiano  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Dianne Poole  
Gilles Bisson, Robert V. Callahan, Bruce Crozier,  
Robert Frankford, Rosario Marchese, Margaret Marland,  
Larry O'Connor, Stephen Owens, Anthony Perruzza,  
David Tilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Todd Decker

**Regulations and private bills/**

**Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair/Présidente: Christel Haeck  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Présidente: Ellen MacKinnon  
Ron Eddy, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Pat Hayes,  
David Johnson, Leo Jordan, Gordon Mills, Hugh O'Neil,  
Anthony Perruzza, Tony Ruprecht  
Clerk/Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Resources development/Développement des ressources**

Chair/Président: Bob Huget  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Mike Cooper  
Sean G. Conway, Joan M. Fawcett, Leo Jordan, Paul  
Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Turnbull,  
Daniel Waters, Gary Wilson, Len Wood  
Clerk/Greffière: Tannis Manikel

**Social development/Affaires sociales**

Chair/Président: Charles Beer  
Vice-Chair/Vice-Président: Ron Eddy  
Jenny Carter, Dianne Cunningham, Randy R. Hope,  
Tony Martin, Dalton McGuinty, Larry O'Connor,  
Yvonne O'Neill, Stephen Owens, Tony Rizzo, Jim Wilson  
Clerk/Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et le premier lundi de chaque mois.



# CONTENTS

Wednesday 13 April 1994

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|                                      |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| <b>Cheque cashing bill</b>           |      |
| Mr Morin .....                       | 5565 |
| <b>Forest industry</b>               |      |
| Mr Jordan .....                      | 5565 |
| <b>YWCA awards</b>                   |      |
| Ms Carter .....                      | 5565 |
| <b>Pension funds</b>                 |      |
| Mrs Caplan .....                     | 5565 |
| <b>Niagara Escarpment Commission</b> |      |
| Mr Murdoch .....                     | 5566 |
| <b>Purchase of paper mill</b>        |      |
| Mr Wood .....                        | 5566 |
| <b>Social assistance</b>             |      |
| Mrs O'Neill .....                    | 5566 |
| <b>Health cards</b>                  |      |
| Mr Tilson .....                      | 5566 |
| <b>Science fair</b>                  |      |
| Mr Gary Wilson .....                 | 5567 |
| <b>Business practices</b>            |      |
| Mr Ferguson .....                    | 5567 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| <b>Gun control</b>             |      |
| Mr Conway .....                | 5567 |
| Mr Christopherson .....        | 5568 |
| <b>Justice system</b>          |      |
| Mr Conway .....                | 5569 |
| Mrs Boyd .....                 | 5569 |
| <b>Victims of crime</b>        |      |
| Mr Jackson .....               | 5570 |
| Mrs Boyd .....                 | 5571 |
| <b>Labour dispute</b>          |      |
| Mr Harris .....                | 5572 |
| Ms Swarbrick .....             | 5572 |
| <b>Robin Sears</b>             |      |
| Mr Kwinter .....               | 5573 |
| Mr Rae .....                   | 5573 |
| <b>Massey Centre for Women</b> |      |
| Mr David Johnson .....         | 5574 |
| Ms Gigantes .....              | 5574 |

## Motorcycles

|                           |            |
|---------------------------|------------|
| Mr Hansen .....           | 5574       |
| Mr Charlton .....         | 5574, 5575 |
| Mr Cooper .....           | 5575       |
| <b>Youth unemployment</b> |            |
| Mr Phillips .....         | 5575       |
| Mr Charlton .....         | 5575       |

## PETITIONS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Violence</b>                                |      |
| Ms Poole .....                                 | 5577 |
| Mr Bradley .....                               | 5577 |
| Mr Elston .....                                | 5578 |
| <b>Collingwood General and Marine Hospital</b> |      |
| Mr Jim Wilson .....                            | 5577 |
| <b>Firearms safety</b>                         |      |
| Mr Sutherland .....                            | 5577 |
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>                      |      |
| Mr Tilson .....                                | 5577 |
| <b>Tobacco packaging</b>                       |      |
| Mr Runciman .....                              | 5578 |

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Standing committee on regulations and private bills, Ms Haeck</b> |      |
| Ms Haeck .....   | 5578 |
| Report adopted .....   | 5578 |

## FIRST READINGS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>County of Essex Act, 1994, Bill Pr103, Mr Hayes</b>                      |      |
| Mr Hayes .....  | 5578 |
| Agreed to .....   | 5578 |
| <b>County of Essex Local Municipalities Act, 1994, Bill Pr108, Mr Hayes</b> |      |
| Mr Hayes .....  | 5578 |
| Agreed to .....   | 5578 |

## SECOND READINGS

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 138, Mr Laughren</b> |            |
| Mr Sutherland .....  | 5578       |
| Mr Runciman .....  | 5579       |
| Mr Cousens .....   | 5579       |
| Mr McGuinty .....  | 5579       |
| Mr David Johnson .....   | 5583       |
| Mr Turnbull .... 5587, 5590, 5594                                  |            |
| Mr Offer .....   | 5587, 5589 |
| Mrs Sullivan .....   | 5589       |
| Mr Owens .....   | 5593       |
| Mr Stockwell .....   | 5594       |
| Mr O'Connor .....  | 5594       |
| Mr Farnan .....  | 5594       |
| Mr Brown .....   | 5595       |
| Deemed adjourned .....   | 5600       |

## OTHER BUSINESS

|                        |      |
|------------------------|------|
| <b>Question period</b> |      |
| Mr Hope .....          | 5576 |
| Mr Elston .....        | 5576 |
| Mr Harnick .....       | 5576 |
| The Speaker .....      | 5576 |
| Mr Stockwell .....     | 5576 |

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 13 avril 1994

## DEUXIÈME LECTURE

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1993 modifiant la Loi sur la taxe de vente au détail, projet de loi 138, M. Laughren</b> |      |
| de loi 138, M. Laughren .....  | 5578 |
| Débat ajourné .....  | 5600 |



No. 113

N° 113

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 35th Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**Troisième session, 35<sup>e</sup> législature**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

Thursday 14 April 1994

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

Jeudi 14 avril 1994

Speaker  
Honourable David WarnerClerk  
Claude L. DesRosiersPrésident  
L'honorable David WarnerGreffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers*50th anniversary***1944–1994***50<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*



### **Hansard is 50**

Hansard reporting of complete sessions of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario began on 23 February 1944 with the 21st Parliament. The reports were prepared by shorthand reporters who dictated their notes to typists. Copies of each Hansard on onion-skin paper were distributed only to party leaders, the cabinet and the legislative library. Formal printing and indexing began in 1947.

Today's debates are recorded on audio cassettes. A staff of 50 transcribes, edits, formats and indexes the reports on computer. About three hours after adjournment, the report of that day's House sitting is transmitted to the printer and to the parliamentary television channel for broadcast throughout the province.

A commemorative display may be viewed on the main floor of the Legislative Building.

### **Hansard on your computer**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. For a brochure describing the service, call 416-325-3942.

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-7411.

### **Subscriptions**

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats a 50 ans**

Le reportage des sessions intégrales de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, fait par le Journal de débats, a commencé le 23 février 1944 avec la 21<sup>e</sup> législature. Les comptes rendus ont été préparés par des reporters qui dictaient leurs notes en sténo à des dactylos. Les fascicules du Journal des débats, en papier pelure, n'ont été distribués qu'aux leaders des partis, au Conseil des ministres et à la bibliothèque législative. L'impression et l'indexation ont commencé en 1947.

Les débats d'aujourd'hui sont enregistrés sur bande. Le personnel de 50 fait la saisie, la révision, la mise en pages et l'indexation du Journal sur ordinateur. Trois heures environ après l'ajournement de la Chambre, le compte rendu de la séance est transmis à la maison d'impression et à la chaîne parlementaire pour être diffusé à travers la province.

Une exposition pour marquer cet événement est étalée au premier étage de l'Édifice du Parlement.

### **Le Journal des débats sur votre ordinateur**

Le Journal des débats et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative pourront paraître sur l'écran de votre ordinateur personnel en quelques heures seulement après la séance. Pour obtenir une brochure décrivant le service, téléphoner au 416-325-3942.

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-7411.

### **Abonnements**

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 14 April 1994

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 14 avril 1994

The House met at 1001.

Prayers.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

### HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT (BLOOD-ALCOHOL), 1993

#### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LE CODE DE LA ROUTE (PRÉSENCE D'ALCOOL DANS LE SANG)

Mr Offer moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 93, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act / Projet de loi 93, Loi modifiant le Code de la route.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Mr Offer, you will have 10 minutes to initiate debate, after which every recognized party within the Legislature will have 15 minutes each to debate, and then you will have two minutes in summation.

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** In the time allocated, I firstly would ask for the Legislature to give approval to second reading of Bill 93, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

The reason for my request to ask for the passage of second reading of this bill follows from its explanatory note:

"This bill prohibit persons under nineteen from operating a motor vehicle while having any alcohol in their blood. The penalty for contravention is the suspension of the person's driver's licence for one year."

It is my belief that the passage of this bill will, as a result of the explanatory note, cause less death on the road as a result of motor vehicle crashes in which alcohol is a contributing factor and will also reduce the number of injuries to our young people as a result of, again, motor vehicle crashes where alcohol is a factor.

Members of the Legislature will know that I was one of those members on the committee which was looking into the issue of graduated licensing, and it is fair to say that that particular initiative received wide acceptance. It is also clear that those who came before the committee, while signifying their approval of the graduated licensing scheme, also said that it was a good first step but it indeed could be made stronger.

I discussed this particular initiative in my constituency, through letters to my constituents, cable TV programs, columns in local newspapers, and the reaction to the initiative has really been a direct reflection of those who came before the committee and, indeed, I believe the reflection and opinions of people across the province.

But we also heard at the hearings from Dr James Young, who is the chief coroner of the province of Ontario, and we heard about the incidence of drinking and driving and we saw in cold, hard numbers what that means: the death, the injury and the destruction of

property. I know that numbers cannot in any way measure the human tragedy of what befalls a family and friends for those who are involved in car crashes, but none the less it is something we which have to use to underscore a particular need for improved legislation.

I have been informed that there have been, I believe, 14,012 drinking drivers involved in crashes: 7,525 of those drivers were involved in property damage crashes, 6,193 drivers were involved in personal injury crashes and 294 drivers were involved in fatal crashes. My bill will hopefully address this particular tragedy.

We know the current law in this province is that the legal age to drink is 19. We also know that any driver of a motor vehicle exceeding a blood alcohol level of 0.08%, upon conviction, has their licence suspended. It does not matter whether the person was driving erratically, swerving or exhibiting any signs of impairment. If a person, after taking a breathalyser test, exceeds the legal limit, then they lose their licence for a year. It is straightforward, it is clear, the penalty is strong and the result over the years has been less injury and death on the roads.

As I've said, we know that the legal age for drinking is 19, but here is the area my bill wishes to address. My bill will state that if a driver under that age, 16, 17 or 18, is stopped and has any alcohol in their body—because that is the current law in this province, people under the age of 19 are not allowed to drink. So if a person 16, 17 or 18 years of age is driving a motor vehicle and has any alcohol in their body, then upon conviction, their licence would be suspended for one year. I believe this is reasonable. I believe it sends out a very clear signal to all that drinking and driving do not mix, that if this is followed, there will be less death, there will be less injury and there will be less property damage on the roads.

I know, under the graduated licensing system, there has been a small improvement in this area, and that small improvement is that if someone under the age of 19 does have alcohol in their body, then their licence is suspended for 30 days. But I do not believe that is enough. I believe we must send out a clear and strong and firm message, when young people get behind the wheel for the first time, that their penalty is the same as our penalty, that if we contravene the driving rules by driving with alcohol in our body, then upon a first conviction, our licence is suspended for one year.

It is coincidental, but none the less a fact, that in my local newspaper, the Mississauga News, of Wednesday, April 13, there was an article entitled "Driving Sober is Cool with These Teens." It recites that there was a conference held in my riding, at the Delta Meadowvale Hotel and Conference Centre, by a group called Ontario Students Against Impaired Driving.



1010

The article says: "Last year in Canada, 34 people per hour were killed in alcohol-related accidents. It's a figure 18-year-old Kathy Simington of Paris, Ontario, would like to see whittled down to zero." I agree with her.

It goes on: "'In the past year we've seen so many friends die and it's all been related to alcohol,' said Simington. 'It's just peer pressure I guess, but if it only takes one person to put on the pressure, then it should only take one person to take it off too. It's the domino effect.'"

I agree. I hope that this bill will add to that peer pressure to send out the message that drinking and driving do not mix and the penalty for contravening this rule is at least a one-year suspension.

The article goes on: "A desire to be that one person was a motivating factor in inspiring Simington to join the Ontario Students Against Impaired Driving (OSAID) at her local high school, an involvement that brought her and close to 500 other Ontario students to a conference at the Delta Meadowvale Hotel and Conference Centre last week."

It goes on to say: "'You can't stop people from drinking, but the idea is to stop them from getting behind the wheel afterwards. I know so many people who have been in drunk driving accidents,' says Jeanette Harris, 18, of Brantford.

"Mandy Stringle, 18, of St Thomas agrees. 'Drunk driving is a real problem at our schools because teens go out there and drink and don't know the facts. Teens think they're indestructible, but we learn at the group that this is definitely not true.'" The article goes on.

I would like to take a moment to congratulate the Ontario Students Against Impaired Driving organization. I'd also like to congratulate the Mississauga News, cable 10, the Mississauga Booster, the Streetsville Booster, in my area for carrying on the message in so many ways that drinking and driving do not mix.

This particular bill is designed to do one very simple yet very important area: It is designed to say to young people, 16, 17 and 18, who have the right to drive but under our laws do not yet have the right to legally consume alcohol, "If you go behind the wheel of a motor vehicle with any alcohol in your body, because you have contravened the current laws of the province of Ontario, upon conviction, your licence is taken away for one year."

I believe that this will result in a reduction in death, injury and property damage, and I hope that all members of the Legislature will support this bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Mississauga North will have two minutes to participate at the end of the debate. All parties now have up to 15 minutes to participate in the second reading debate of Bill 93.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** I'm pleased to rise today in broad support in principle for this bill. I do have some problems which I would like to outline, but I believe the member brings it sincerely in his concern for protecting the lives of our young people.

Indeed this effort I think will be applauded by Mothers Against Drunk Driving. During the hearings into graduated licensing—which I feel personally very responsible for, because for some two years before the government brought forward graduated licensing, I was asking in this House for this measure—we heard from John Bates of Mothers Against Drunk Driving, and it was just one of his quotes which really jumps out at me from his testimony: "Drivers between the ages of 16 and 20 make up 5% of the driving population...for 13% of all traffic accidents, 70% of impaired and 18% of all fatal crashes," indeed a very, very serious statistic.

Mothers Against Drunk Driving would like to see the age for drinking raised significantly and many coroners' inquests have suggested this would be a useful move. In fact Mothers Against Drunk Driving have suggested we should have zero tolerance for any alcoholic consumption when somebody gets behind the wheel of a car. Indeed, I think we can all sympathize with their concerns.

The problem that we have with this bill—and I believe we can further discuss this if it's passed today and we can send this out to a committee and at least address these problems. One of them is that during the graduated licence hearings it was pointed out by the Ministry of Transportation that they were concerned that we had a number of people who were driving without any licence, and if we were to suspend these teenagers for this offence for one year we might encourage these teenagers—and undoubtedly they are the more reckless types of teenagers who would be drinking and driving in the first place and contravening the law—to go and drive a car without a licence. That has very serious implications in terms of insurance and so far as the crash victims are concerned, if these people are driving under those circumstances.

There is additionally the very real possibility of a charter challenge if we treat these citizens differently from others, because the police at this moment have the right to suspend for 24 hours the licence of anybody who is driving with a blood alcohol level over 0.05 against the 0.08 which we so typically talk about as the point at which you will be charged with drunk driving.

If we treat these teenagers differently, there could be a charter challenge on the basis that we are discriminating by age. I think it's unfortunate that the charter presents us these kinds of problems and challenges, because I do believe that the intent of this bill is right-headed. However, it is a problem and we should recognize that, and certainly at committee we should discuss that and see if there's any way we can address that particular problem.

In terms of my position as Transportation critic for the PC Party, we are in favour in principle of this measure. I applaud my colleague for bringing it forward, but I do hope that in his closing remarks he can speak to those two concerns I have raised today.

**Mr George Dadamo (Windsor-Sandwich):** I want to stress further that public hearings, of course, were held here in Toronto and around the province of Ontario on this particular issue of graduated licensing, the resources development committee taking that on the road.

I'd also like to stress, the committee considered this issue and concluded that additional sanctions would not

be appropriate, as a problem of underage drinking is an issue more closely related to social and health policy than to driver licensing.

Since the private member's bill proposed by the member for Mississauga North, Mr Offer, parallels one of the new licensing conditions—it would apply to most of the same drivers—the Ministry of Transportation would prefer to evaluate the effectiveness of the graduated licensing restriction as a deterrent measure rather than creating a new violation.

As parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation and as a member of that committee, I'd like to thank those who came before us across the province of Ontario and gave us much direction and advice on the issue of graduated licensing.

I rise today to address the private member's bill from the member for Mississauga North and the government believes that, while the member's bill is indeed well intentioned, the changes it proposes are unnecessary; they are already covered under the new graduated licensing rules. New drivers applying after April 1, 1994, for a licence will be the first to enter Ontario's new system.

Learning to drive safely is difficult enough without adding alcohol to the mix. New drivers of all ages are overrepresented in collision stats. This is especially true for those between 16 and 24 years of age. These young people comprise 16% of all licensed drivers but 25% of all drivers that are killed. They are three times as likely to be killed on the road as to die from suicide or cancer. Road collisions are the leading cause of death among this age group. The human toll of collisions, as you know, is staggering, and we must also consider the financial impact, costs that total well over \$9 billion a year for property damage, health care, wage loss and also future earnings.

1020

That is why the government included tough but realistic penalties for drinking and driving under graduated licensing. This law, which will be fully in effect on June 6, 1994, establishes a clear policy of zero tolerance for alcohol during the two-year graduated program. New drivers must not drink at all when driving. Graduated licensing effectively prohibits all drivers under 19 years of age from drinking and driving. It is that simple.

In addition, all new drivers must be accompanied by a licensed driver with at least four years' experience. That experienced driver, who might be asked to take the wheel in certain circumstances, must therefore also maintain a blood alcohol concentration of less than 0.05%.

I'm quite sure all members would agree that drinking and driving invites disaster at any time, but now there's one more reason not to drink and drive: It also violates the conditions of the graduated licensing.

Graduated licensing imposes the most stringent restrictions ever on new drivers anywhere in North America. We will be evaluating the new system's effectiveness as a deterrent to drinking drivers and can make any adjustments that prove necessary.

The government feels there is no need for any new laws covering this matter. The Minister of Transportation

does not see the justification for creating a new violation, as proposed by this private member's bill. In fact, we believe that graduated licensing takes the member's bill one step further by prohibiting all new drivers from drinking and driving.

The government takes the matter of drinking and driving very seriously. We are committed to ensuring that new drivers of all ages learn their driving skills gradually, in low-risk conditions and also in alcohol-free conditions.

Graduated licensing is part of the government's safety agenda, designed to make Ontario roads the safest in North America. The member presenting this bill today and the government have the same goal: to save lives by making our roads safer. It is a goal we all share. We would allow the law to do its job.

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I am very pleased to enter the debate today in support of the bill put forward by the member for Mississauga North. First of all, I would like to commend the member for Mississauga North for bringing forth this bill. I think it reflects his interest in protecting the young people of this province and it also reflects his very keen interest in ensuring that drinking and driving never, ever mix.

The member for Mississauga North mentioned some statistics. I just happened the other day to be reading through the Queen's Park report for Hans Daigeler, the MPP for Nepean, and, as you know, he is also the Transportation critic for our caucus. So even before I knew the member for Mississauga North's bill was coming forward today, I was looking through these statistics with great interest.

I'd like to let you know a few other statistics that I think are very important; one relates to the trends in drinking and driving. The number of drinking drivers involved in crashes decreased by 47% from 1982 to 1991. That is really welcome news. It means our educational programs are working, it means our RIDE programs are working, it means there is the public will and the political will to do something about this devastating problem. But the fact of the matter is that there are still 14,012 crashes caused per year in Ontario where there is drinking and driving.

If you look at the statistics for drivers fatally injured in crashes who were tested in 1991, 55% showed no evidence of alcohol. However, 45% were still found to have been drinking prior to the crash, and of those, 37% had a blood alcohol content over the legal limit—37%. It means it is still a problem.

Of course, many times the statistics about young people and drinking and driving have been reiterated. However, I'd like to mention one other statistic, and it involves the characteristics of drinking drivers involved in crashes. Drivers aged 25 to 34 accounted for the largest proportion, that is, 38%, of all drinking drivers involved in crashes. I suspect they are proportionately a much larger body of drivers to begin with. However, drivers aged 16 to 24 were second, accounting for 28%. That means our young people are still drinking and driving.

The law of the province is that a person cannot drink



until the age of 19; that's very clear. Yet I think we are sending out a mixed message when there's no specific penalty for drinking and driving under the age of 19. We have heard from the parliamentary assistant, and certainly a letter—I have a copy from both the Attorney General and the Minister of Transportation—which quotes current provisions of the Criminal Code and also talks about graduated licences.

I commend the government for coming forward with the graduated licence program. I have been a strong supporter of it since it was first supported in 1989 by the then Liberal government. I was very pleased that we were moving ahead, and I was glad to see that the NDP government followed this commitment and did bring in the legislation. We all waited a long time for it, and we believe it will have a major impact on drinking and driving and on the driving habits of our young people.

I supported that legislation, notwithstanding that I have a 15-year-old daughter who turns 16 next month and notwithstanding that I have an 18-year-old son who, when news last year came forward that they were going to bring in graduated licences, decided that maybe it was time to get his licence. I talked to not only my own teenagers but also to other young people at the time. I am not naïve. I do not believe that because the law of the land says there shall be no drinking until the age of 19, that in fact happens in every instance. In fact, it's clear that there is violation of this law.

I remember that back when I was a teenager—and this was a very, very long time ago—at that stage the law was actually that you could not drink till the age of 21. In fact, I had graduated from university prior to being able to drink. I think at the time the politicians and the people made the decision that it was somewhat unreasonable that a person could leave their teen years and have to attain the age of 21 years before they could legally drink. They changed the law because it was being flouted. The reason they changed it to 19 was to keep alcohol out of the high schools.

But having said that, we still know it occurs. While we can encourage our young people not to drink or, at the very minimum, to drink responsibly, I'm not sure our message that they shouldn't be drinking till the legal age of 19 ever really gets through. But there is one message that we have to get through, and that is that they should not drink and drive.

I am very encouraged by speaking to young people, by speaking to my 18-year-old son. I know his policy is zero tolerance. He will not allow a friend of his to get behind the wheel of a car if they have had anything to drink, even one beer. To him, this is totally unacceptable. My son is not unique; I think a lot of young people have this message. But I think we need to reinforce that message of zero tolerance.

I would like to bring up another matter. If members of this House can remember when we were young—granted, for most of us, a very long time ago. I don't see Mr Sutherland in the House today; he's probably one of the few for whom it was a relatively recent memory when he was young. But do you remember when you were young and you were first learning to drive, how you obeyed the

letter of the law? You came to a full stop, you always signalled, you never, ever cut in front of anybody, you always drove the speed limit, and you remembered these rules that had been drummed into your head.

1030

**Mr Gordon Mills (Durham East):** What ever happened to that?

**Ms Poole:** The member for Durham East says, "What happened to that?" and he's absolutely right. If you drive on the road today, you know that a lot of us have tended over time to kind of bend those rules. What we started out in a very principled way has changed.

But that's where it ties in to drinking and driving. If we say to young people from the moment they are driving that there is zero tolerance—and the member for Mississauga North's bill says this very unequivocally. There is a special penalty for those who are under the legal drinking age and have any blood alcohol content at all. I'm not sure if that was the right phrase, whether it's "blood alcohol" or "alcohol blood content," but you know what I mean.

It's important when they start out that they start out fresh, believing that you cannot under any circumstances, even with one beer, drink and drive, because we know that as human beings, over the years we will tend to relax our rules, we will tend to relax our principles, we will tend to relax what we have learned. So I think it's very important to emphasize right from day one that we have zero tolerance.

The member for York Mills mentioned the possibility of the charter challenge because of the discrimination on age. I really cannot see this as a problem because, after all, we have in law right now a provision that you cannot drink until you are the age of 19. That is the law. It has never been challenged under the charter, even though the charter has been around for, what, 12 years now? This ties in very clearly with that drinking age that has been mandated by the laws of the province and found by the Legislature of this province and the people of this province to be a reasonable law. So I can't see why it would be a charter challenge on discrimination by age when we already have made that decision that young people under the age of 19 shall not drink.

I'd like to conclude by reading a letter of support that came from the Police Association of Ontario. This is a letter they sent Mr Offer on November 15, 1993. They say:

"Pursuant to your correspondence of October 14 past in relation to the bill you introduced into the Legislature on October 7, which, if adopted, would prohibit persons under the age of 19 from operating a motor vehicle while having any alcohol in their blood, I am pleased to respond as follows.

"The executive board of the Police Association of Ontario met in Burlington on November 3 and 4, and a copy of your bill to amend the Highway Traffic Act in this regard was distributed to those delegates in attendance. Subsequent to reviewing this matter our delegates adopted a motion supporting your bill.

"We trust that our actions in this matter meet with

your approval and we wish you well in your efforts to have this proposed legislation enacted."

It is signed by Mal Connolly, administrator for the Police Association of Ontario.

Mr Offer, the member for Mississauga North, has mentioned several other areas of support, very strong support: from students, from local media, from parents and from legislators. I really feel that notwithstanding the fact we've put in the graduated licence system, we have to take that extra step, make it very clear that it is zero tolerance and that there is a significant penalty attached to drinking and driving if you are under the legal age. If I had my wish, it would be zero tolerance for all parties, but that is probably something that, while we will pursue it as a goal, may never reach universal acceptability. But we can but try.

So I commend the member for Mississauga North. I very much appreciate his standing up on behalf of the young people of this province, the parents of this province and the drivers of this province, and I thank him.

**Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East):** I welcome the opportunity to comment briefly on private member's Bill 93, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act. It's a very short bill. Thursday morning is the right time for private members' bills, and this one, I think, is appropriate.

Section 38.1 of the Highway Traffic Amendment Act says:

"No person under the age of nineteen...shall drive or operate a motor vehicle on a highway while having alcohol in his or her blood."

It says:

"Section 41 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(1.1) The driver's licence of a person who is convicted of an offence under section 38.1 is thereupon suspended for a period of one year."

I trust the people all agree that operating a motor vehicle under the influence of alcohol is just not socially acceptable. It should be just as unacceptable to operate a vehicle with any level of alcohol in the blood. It is a sad fact of life that there is still far too much drinking and tragedy on our roads and our highways.

Perhaps people may stop and think before having a drink, and they should before they even consider getting behind the wheel, if they are aware that the first conviction of impaired driving, driving with more than 80 milligrams of alcohol in the blood, is a fine of no less than \$300 and a licence suspension for one year. But that's not all: Their insurance rates go up and their legal costs of going to court. I predict it could be a matter of \$10,000 minimum just for having that one drink and driving.

The second conviction brings a minimum 14-day jail term and a licence suspension for two years, and a third conviction brings a 90-day jail term and a licence suspension of three years. Consider that if you have a job and you were counting on driving to work.

A lot of people realize it when it's too late. That one year to many people will seem like for ever. But I have

to say to you that when we see the second and third convictions, that is really a concern because that means they didn't get the message the first time around. I can tell you, when you have your third conviction, I'm sure the insurance companies are going to find it very difficult to consider you to insure.

Having said that, I would suggest there will be no opposition to private member's Bill 93, but I observe, from the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation, that there is opposition from the government members. He indicates that it's probably already in the legislation they passed with regard to the young drivers, but I think this adds to it.

I would like to take this opportunity to read into the record a short letter I received from a constituent of mine at the time we were dealing with the graduated licensing last December. Jordana Simek, a grade 10 student attending Eastview Secondary School, resident of Oro township, lives about 12 miles from the city of Barrie.

It says: "The government's proposal to legislate graduated licences is unfair to the majority of 16- and 17-year-olds who are responsible. I do not intend to become intoxicated and drive dangerously...how many by males of the same age range" who drive now. "The legislation punishes the majority and merely delays the same youths in acting irresponsibly. Living in the country, a mode of transportation is necessary. Don't make us walk because they broke the law.

"I would greatly appreciate you presenting my and many other future voters' point of view at Queen's Park."

Jordana Simek is referring to the debate on graduated licensing last December. I supported Bill 122. At that time, after raising the issue of young drivers who do live in rural Ontario, Jordana refers to this issue in the following letter I received from her in February:

"I was overwhelmed upon receipt of the Hansard excerpts of December 6, 1993," which she received "on January 4, 1994, my sixteenth birthday. I have since obtained my level 1 Canadian Ski Instructors qualification, written my final exams, continued my piano commitments, and worked as a ski instructor at Pine Ridge Ski Club on weekends. I have also continued to be a member of the jr. girls' volleyball team and have enrolled in Young Drivers of Canada. My parents drive a great deal to provide me with transportation.

"Your efforts in presenting my letter and making a case for the rural youth at Queen's Park far exceed all of my expectations.

"Your actions have made me realize that you are an honest, empathetic and energetic representative of the constituents and in this case, the rural youth of all of Ontario. Thank you."

1040

**Mr Mills:** Is there an election coming up?

**Mr McLean:** That's the type of letter, Gord, that we all should get.

Another Oro resident raises the same issue in a letter I received just this week. I'd like to bring her concerns to your attention:



"My name is Catherine Gilchrist. I am writing this letter about the graduated licensing program. I am 15 and will turn 16 in the fall.

"I live in the country (Oro township), and because transportation is limited, I have to rely on my parents to drive me around. For this reason, it is difficult to find a summer job or to meet friends.

"I understand the reasons for this is so the roads would be safer, but most of the people my age are mature enough to drive in a responsible way." These are some of the comments I've received with regard to the graduated entry licence.

I supported that legislation, but I also brought to the ministry's attention certain young people who are responsible. Most of the accidents that had happened over time was with youth where there were three, four, five people in a car. I often thought there should have been some clause in there that would allow individuals, if they're driving to and from work, to be able to do that.

The concerns I have raised with those two people are the same concerns raised by a rural resident, Mrs Kathleen Rupnow of Hillsdale, when she wrote to me last month about the difficulty in scheduling her son's driver's test.

"My son is already 18 and needs to get his licence for work as he graduates high school this year. Since we live in Hillsdale, he has to drive to work. Since his 365 runs out in June, he will have to do his written test again (additional cost) before he can try his driving test....I don't disagree with the new legislation and I have another son who will be 16 in December who will be affected. I do disagree with a government who would not staff their offices to reduce these ridiculous backlogs during the transition period."

That is her complaint. As I said earlier, the graduated licensing system should have given due consideration to young rural motorists who have no alternative but to drive to and from work.

However, I was pleased that it contained the provisions that a novice driver will be required to maintain a zero blood alcohol content. That was my theory with regard to the bill. Now we have a bill today brought in by the member which is indicating the same. I have no problem in supporting that, because I think the more we debate this issue and get the word out, the better off we'll all be.

The people of Ontario are concerned and upset every time they pick up a newspaper and read about the tragic deaths on our roadways. Traffic collisions are the leading killers of Ontario's young people aged 16 to 24. Almost half of the traffic-related deaths among 16- to 24-year-olds occur when they are driving the vehicle. Most deaths involve new drivers and involve alcohol. I commend the member for Mississauga North for bringing this important matter to our attention today.

With regard to the numerous coroners' reports that we have had on this very issue, they have recommended raising the drinking age. Another strategy is to deal with drinking-and-driving problems. I've had a boating bill before this Legislature on two different occasions which has never gotten past second reading, and a lot of those

accidents on the waterways are caused by drinking. I say to the member for Mississauga North, this just reinforces what a lot of us feel, what a lot of us think.

I want to leave with the message of those people who think and consider that they can drive with an alcohol content in their blood. If you lose your licence, the minimum cost to you, I predict, is some \$10,000 to \$20,000 by the time you're done dealing with the court system, by the time you pay the extra insurance that you're going to be charged and by the time the whole mess is cleared up. I hope those who have their second offence will really stop and consider because, to me, that innocent people are killed by drunk drivers should not be acceptable in society today.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Further debate?

**Mr Mills:** I'm pleased, along with others of my colleagues in the House, to rise and speak to Bill 93, the private member's bill from the member for Mississauga North.

I think it goes without saying that everybody who sits in this Legislature is interested in reducing the terrible carnage that happens on our highways, and the parliamentary assistant, my colleague from Windsor-Sandwich, has already spoken this morning, that what we're talking about in the province of Ontario is a staggering \$9 billion a year that is accountable to traffic accidents with death, the cost of medical care and all those things; \$9 billion.

I think we, as legislators, should stand in our place and be absolutely convinced that we should do everything we can to stop this. I know that our government has done more to make the roads of Ontario safer than any other government which previously sat in this Legislature. We've done more to make Ontario safe.

I find it passing strange that here we have a member who introduced a bill that effectively prohibits all the folks under 19 from driving without zero tolerance, and I subscribe to that, but how on earth can you people, the third party and the official opposition, stand in your places and advocate for something that's going to reduce accidents when you wouldn't support photo-radar?

Photo-radar is proven by statistics, and when I gave my speech on that bill in this Legislature I produced enough statistics that showed you that it reduced deaths and it reduced accidents, and this statistical evidence is all across the country and all over the world. Yet these people stand here today and they want to support a bill that's going to reduce the carnage on the highway. They all stood in their places and they voted against photo-radar, which alone would reduce carnage, reduce deaths and accidents across the province on our highways beyond all kinds of—you know, it's incomprehensible how people can stand there and advocate one form of life-saving and be adamantly opposed to photo-radar. I find that passing strange, to say the least.

Well, lots of things they say I find passing strange, but this sticks in my throat as a former police officer and having to investigate fatal accidents, having been to post-mortems, having to tell people that their young folk have passed away. You want to try that, my friends. You want

to try standing in a post-mortem room and see what happens there. Then, if you had seen all of that, you would willingly stand in your places and support photo-radar, because, man, that is a traumatic experience when you go through that in life. It's a pity that many of you haven't had that experience, because if you had, you would support this government in its overall efforts to reduce the carnage on Ontario highways. We're going a long way to do that and one of the ways that we're achieving that is through graduated licences.

I want to just touch on that. We know and I have no doubts about the good intent of the member for Mississauga North and I support that. However, what we've got to come to grips with is what the graduated licence system is going to do.

It will address the issue of drinking and driving by inexperienced drivers by requiring all new drivers, not just young drivers—statistics show that people over 24, it's not the people who are under 19, they're involved in a lot of drinking and driving accidents, so it's not just young drivers but every inexperienced driver—to maintain a blood alcohol level of zero in their first two years of driving. What could be better? What could be more explicit? What could be more obvious that this government is committed to zero tolerance driving?

We are committed to making the roads of Ontario the safest roads to drive on, not only in Ontario, in North America and in fact in the whole world. We are setting an example in this province, this government is, about driving and safe driving, and our commitment to it, gradually, through different stages, and one of them is the graduated driver's licence.

Our government, in graduated licensing, has included tough but realistic penalties for drinking and driving under the graduated licences.

1050

I agree with my colleague the member for Windsor-Sandwich, the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation, that the Highway Traffic Act is not the vehicle where you impose laws about drinking. That's not the role.

Anyway, I'm going to close up. My colleague wants to talk; I've just got the message, the pink slip. Graduated licensing effectively prohibits all drivers under 19 years of age from drinking and driving. It's that simple.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate.

**Mr Mike Cooper (Kitchener-Wilmot):** I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate on Bill 93. Obviously, what I'd like to do is get some things on the record that came out of the resources development committee. As everyone knows, the member for Mississauga North also sat on that committee and I understand that this is probably his intention, because I would never want to accuse him of grandstanding or jumping on a popular bandwagon of graduated licensing, because I think the member already knows that the laws are already in place, that the legal drinking age in the province of Ontario is the age of 19 and that there are penalties for breaking that law. The Criminal Code of Canada and the Highway Traffic Act currently provide

for the suspension of the driver's licence of any driver convicted of driving while impaired or having a blood alcohol concentration of 0.08%, with a suspension period for first offence being one year, exactly what he's proposing here.

The member sat on the resources development committee, which held public hearings on the graduated licensing system process, and he was involved in the committee process and the public hearings and is fully aware that the committee considered a number of options and sanctions and concluded that further actions beyond those covered under the current graduated licensing process would not be appropriate. The basic agreement is that the issue of drinking under age is related to social and health policy.

Under the graduated licensing system, all new car and motorcycle drivers must not drink any alcohol if they're going to drive. The licensing condition requires the new driver's blood alcohol concentration level to be zero in their first two years of driving. This is not simply restricted to those underage; it is meant for everyone. This ensures that new drivers assume responsibility for their actions or be subject to licensing conditions.

Suspension periods are part of these conditions. These include a one-month suspension for greater than zero and less than 0.05%, and for those individuals with a blood alcohol concentration of greater than 0.05%, the suspension period is one year.

We must remember that there are various situations that may arise in which a person's blood alcohol concentration would be above zero, and these include the use of various cough syrups and medications that include in their content alcohol. The member for Mississauga North is fully aware of this, as it was discussed by various presenters during the public hearings, and this was fully discussed by representatives from the Ministry of Transportation, and he is fully aware that these other variables must be taken into consideration.

As I have previously stated, the member was involved in the committee as it reviewed and conducted public hearings on the Ministry of Transportation graduated licensing system. The member is fully aware of the ministry's recommendations on the six-point integrated safety project. Our government is taking seriously its commitment to make our roads among the safest in North America. The integrated safety project is another safety initiative of the NDP government's vision to make Ontario's roads the safest in North America.

The member is also well aware of the increased numbers of people driving while their licence is under suspension and driving without insurance. This needs to be dealt with, and adding further penalties and suspension only encourages this action to occur more often.

By using state-of-the-art technology, we can improve compliance with Ontario's traffic laws and as a result reduce the toll on Ontario's roads and drivers. If more drivers obey our existing laws and police are better able to enforce these laws, we will reduce highway deaths and injuries.

The more effective and responsible way in which to



deal with the proposal brought forth by the member is to evaluate the effectiveness of the graduated licensing restriction, and since the graduated licensing system just took effect April 1, 1994, then perhaps we should give the graduated licensing system the opportunity to work.

The member for Mississauga North is persistent and is an individual who often needs to have things repeated over and over again to fully grasp ideas. I commend him for his persistence but wish to state that I will not be supporting this bill and feel confident in the laws that currently exist and those included in the six-point integrated safety project. There is not the necessity to duplicate laws.

As the member for Eglinton stated, the Liberals had brought forward this initiative. I know that for years New Democrats have been called Liberals in a hurry. Well, I would suggest to the member opposite that New Democrats are Liberals of action.

**The Acting Speaker:** Any further debate? The member for Mississauga North now has two minutes to respond, plus the remaining time for your party.

**Mr Offer:** In terms of my response, I would first like to thank the members who have spoken in support of the legislation: the member for York Mills, the member for Eglinton and the member for Simcoe East. I appreciate the support.

I am, I must say, a little disappointed with the fact that the government does not see fit to support this legislation. I did write to the Police Association of Ontario. The Police Association of Ontario wrote to me a letter under the date of November 15, where it indicated its full support for this very short yet very direct piece of legislation.

I did take this matter up earlier with the Minister of Transportation and with the Attorney General. I took this matter up with them when I first introduced the legislation. I felt very strongly about this legislation in terms of its saying to people who are 16, 17 and 18 that, "Under the current laws of the province of Ontario, you cannot legally drink," saying to those 16-, 17- and 18-year-old people, "If you break that law, which is your law, by not only drinking but getting behind the wheel of a motor vehicle, your licence upon conviction will be suspended for one year." I felt and feel very strongly that this bill would save lives, would reduce injury and would reduce property damage.

I was very disappointed that the Attorney General and the Minister of Transportation wrote to me saying that they wouldn't support the legislation, but I thought that since those letters were dated from the Ministry of Transportation November 24 and from the Attorney General March 29, possibly they and/or their caucus might have changed their position. Hearing the debate from the government members today, I see that is unlikely.

This bill is not directed to us here; it's directed to young people who are sitting in the gallery today, young people who I believe would be safer on the roads if this particular bill were passed.

The members of the government have hung their hats

on graduated licensing. Graduated licensing will, first, give a penalty of only 30 days for drinking and driving. I believe that is not a sufficient penalty. A penalty must be in line with the type of penalty that we suffer, and that is at least one year. We realize that the result of the strict drinking-and-driving penalties has been a reduction of death, has been a reduction of injury, has been a reduction of property damage. What I want to do is extend that to the 16-, 17- and 18-year-olds. The passage of this bill will allow that.

The members on the government side have spoken about the \$9 billion that is lost and about carnage on the highways, all of which I agree with. So I am disappointed that while eloquently speaking about the cost in terms of dollars and the cost in terms of lives, they do not support a bill which will in fact reduce property damage, reduce injury, reduce death on our roads.

The members of the government have spoken about graduated licensing. I opened up my comments by saying I was a member of that committee. I understand graduated licensing. Members of the government should recognize that the 30-day penalty only applies to young people while they are in that system. Members of the government should remember that that means a person will be in and possibly out of graduated licensing by 17½, actually 17 years and eight months.

Graduated licensing will only apply and that very small penalty will only apply when they are in that system. They could be out of that system when they are 17 and 18 years old. Graduated licensing, which you have hung your hat on, will not help those who are under the age of 19 and outside of the graduated licensing system. Understand your own legislation.

My time is just about up. I urge the members of government: Support this bill. It will reduce property damage, it will reduce injury, it will reduce death on the road for our young people. I urge you to support this legislation.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired. The time for ballot item number 47 has expired. A vote will take place at 12 noon.

1100

#### JUNIOR KINDERGARTEN

Mr Arnott moved private member's notice of motion number 36:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should refrain from continuing to implement the policy announced by the previous Liberal government, in the 1989 throne speech, of forcing all school boards in Ontario to initiate junior kindergarten programs by the fall of 1994.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** Pursuant to standing order 96(c)(i), the member has 10 minutes for his presentation and then each party will have 15 minutes to debate.

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** This resolution comes from the people of Wellington. For the past three and a half years it has been my privilege and honour to represent them here in this Legislature, to work and speak on their behalf.

It is a responsibility I have taken very seriously, as I have endeavoured to represent their views and be true to the values and principles of the people who sent me here to speak on their behalf in the best way that I can: to voice the common sense of the farmer in West Luther township, the wisdom of the retired senior in Harriston, the concerns of the shopkeeper in Erin, the homemaker in Aberfoyle, the small manufacturer in Fergus, the factory worker in Arthur, all of the people of Wellington, to the very best of my ability.

This resolution is about education, in our federation the provincial government's constitutional responsibility and government's most important long-term investment, for with excellence in education, our children will grow to show the world that Ontario, Canada, is its centre, leading in the arts and culture, leading in science and technology, leading in commerce and business. But without excellence in education, our children will grow to show the world nothing more than mediocrity and decline. That's why we must strive for excellence.

More specifically, this resolution is about how the New Democrats have continued the policy of their Liberal predecessors to force all school boards in Ontario to initiate junior kindergarten programs by the academic year coming, 1994-95.

It's an issue which raises many questions: What will this cost the taxpayers of Ontario? What about local autonomy, the whole rationale for the existence of local school boards; the idea that excellence demands you allow for local differences through flexibility in the application of programs in different areas of the province; the idea that Toronto is different from Drayton and Mount Forest, much different, and also different from the communities in Halton, Wentworth and Simcoe? That's why we have school boards: to allow for excellence by allowing them to tailor education to fit their local community's needs.

Other questions arise: Are Ontario's teachers prepared and qualified to teach four-year-olds and in some cases three-year-olds? Have teachers been consulted? Have parents? Have taxpayers?

What about our children, our toddlers, as they really are at three and four? Is it really in their best interests to start school at this tender age? Is it safe to put a toddler on a school bus? These questions need to be answered during the course of this debate, and if the answers are as evasive or don't make sense or are as inadequate as they've been to date from this government, then members of this Legislature must support this resolution.

Junior kindergarten is a very important issue, but it's symbolic of an even larger issue. More than three years ago, I rose to join in our first debate of this 35th Parliament on the NDP government's first throne speech. I was in the back row then and I'm still in the back row, which tells you something about the last three years. But don't get me wrong; I'm very content to be here.

In that first speech in December 1990, I said: "We in Wellington understand the economic value of hard work and the social value of personal responsibility. From this understanding stems a serious concern when our government refuses to live within its means, when our govern-

ment grows until it begins to inhibit overall economic growth, when even excessive taxation does not prevent the expansion of government debt."

In the three years since I gave that first speech I have heard, time and time again, from people in Wellington county how the NDP policy agenda runs totally contrary, totally against those basic principles that we expect from our government, the simple principles that govern the daily lives of all of us in Wellington, policies like mandatory junior kindergarten being forced on us in 1994-95.

I am totally opposed to mandatory junior kindergarten for Wellington county because I'm convinced that the vast majority of people in Wellington believe we don't want it, can't afford it and don't need it. I believe it should be an optional program which communities and local boards can decide upon for themselves to see if it's necessary for their own needs and their own people.

I'm absolutely convinced of this based on what I've heard since I campaigned against the Liberal mandatory junior kindergarten plan in 1990 and since our New Directions policy paper on education, which was released in 1992, in which we called upon the government to make junior kindergarten a local option. Based on what I've heard since I asked constituents in a questionnaire which I send to every household in Wellington last spring, a full 80% of more than 1,000 responses I've received to date said they were against mandatory junior kindergarten.

Since, in response to a constituent's request recently, I launched a petition about two months ago, which hundreds have signed from Wellington and beyond, calling upon the government to cancel its policy of forcing junior kindergarten on to local school boards.

Since I've introduced this for debate in the Legislature, I have received much support for this resolution. I've received support from the Wellington county council unanimously. I've received support from the town of Fergus council, unanimously; the town of Mount Forest council; the village of Arthur council; the township of Arthur council; the township of West Garafraxa council; the Wellington County Board of Education, our public board, several of whose members, trustees, are with us in the gallery today to listen to this debate.

I've also received support from the Wellington county separate school board and many ordinary people, parents, who've written to me in the past few weeks expressing support for this resolution, people like Bob and Loretta Bray of RR 3, Listowel, who have written to me, and I'd like to read this letter into the record.

"Mr Arnott:

"We are in total agreement and support your position concerning the forced implementation of junior kindergarten by the Ontario government.

"We feel very strongly that junior kindergarten is not required and should not be implemented. We do not see any benefit to the children and have seen many disadvantages to the implementation of junior kindergarten in the Perth county separate school system.

"In our opinion, junior kindergarten is a very expens-



ive substitute to day care—and not everyone needs to send their children out to day care. Therefore, those who do not have the need for day care should not have to pay for other parents to send their children.

"This letter is a written endorsement of your resolution which will request the Ontario government to refrain from forcing the implementation of junior kindergarten into our Ontario schools."

I've received a number of letters of this nature. I wanted to read this one into the record.

When we get into the issue of cost, we have a number of estimates that are coming out of Wellington county as to what this will cost local taxpayers and beyond, all of us as taxpayers in Ontario.

A consistent estimate is approximately \$4.5 million for our local school board annually in terms of operating cost, and it's my understanding from meeting with some of our board trustees this morning that a new, more recent plan, which follows the one that was rejected by the New Democrats recently, indicates that it will cost in total to initiate junior kindergarten for the next three years about \$7.7 million. That will be the total cost.

1110

That means higher local taxes or less government programs, less school board programs, many of which are very important to parents and the students who are in the system: programs like core French, programs like teachers' aides for children who are integrated into regular classrooms but who have disabilities and special needs.

We have something like 190 portables in our Wellington county public system, and so we see the need for new capital money being made available which would be appropriate for new classrooms for all the students, yet we find this is the government's priority.

We see this idea coming forward in a time of a very difficult financial situation in terms of the province of Ontario. When the New Democrats came to office, as we know, the provincial debt was approximately \$40 billion. In four years they've doubled that to approximately \$80 billion.

#### *Interjection.*

**Mr Arnott:** Yes, here we go again. I'm going to continue raising it because you know and I know that this is additional money that the kids we're talking about in the context of this debate will be forced to pay the interest on and pay the principal at some point to retire that debt. It demonstrates the absolute irresponsibility of this government in a financial sense.

We've seen the context of this year's deficit numbers: \$10 billion to \$12 billion, the government's not sure. Yet they walk around in a daze saying: "We don't know where to cut. We don't know what we're going to do." Here's an example of a program that should be made optional.

I'd like to conclude my initial remarks by indicating that I have received the support also of the Ontario Public School Boards' Association for this resolution and they have said, "The forced implementation of junior kindergarten, like any new program, is a drain on school boards' resources."

#### **The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Derek Fletcher (Guelph):** I'm very pleased to be able to rise on this issue of junior kindergarten, its implementation and Wellington county.

The government's policy, as with the previous government, has always been to provide four-year-old children with the opportunity to benefit from a junior kindergarten program. It has always been the case that participation in junior kindergarten and kindergarten is the choice of the parent. A child is not required to attend school until they're six years old in Ontario; that's the legal age for attending school. So this is a choice that parents will make.

Parents who choose not to enrol their children in junior kindergarten have done so in many areas because the program is not being offered. So there's a bit of a discriminatory barrier in certain areas. It's clear that many parents want their children to have the opportunity to enrich their learning, and let us remember that children of kindergarten age are natural, eager and enthusiastic learners and the junior kindergarten program will enhance this.

The policy requiring all boards to offer junior kindergarten was first announced, as was mentioned by my colleague from Wellington, in the 1989 throne speech. In that throne speech they said, "The early childhood years are the most important years for acquiring basic learning and social skills." When we talk about the benefits to children, I think there are many to be learned.

In fact, the Wellington county school board research on multi-age groupings, which is the program it wishes to implement over the next three years, states:

"Multi-age grouping is an organizational strategy that combines two or more grades into one classroom. Multi-age groupings foster the feeling of family and community within the class. Children increase their awareness of others and gain appreciation and acceptance of differences which results in reduced competition and high levels of cooperation.

"Specific benefits to younger children: In the early years, language development is critical. Multi-age groupings show a natural acceleration in language development. Older students provide models of language, behaviour and problem-solving and are a support to the learning of younger children." Children helping children.

The Ministry of Education and Training has conducted extensive consultations on kindergarten and junior kindergarten programs, and when Bill 4 received royal assent on July 29, 1993, it required the establishment of junior kindergarten programs by September 1994. But the government has listened to some of the concerns of school boards, and the school boards that do not currently have junior kindergarten can apply for an exemption, and that's what the Wellington county board has done, applied for an exemption so that it could have a phased-in program from this year until 1997.

It must be emphasized that approximately four out of five boards will offer a full junior kindergarten program in September 1994, and many of these boards of course offered junior kindergarten years before they were

required to do so. In fact, only 22 boards in Ontario are in the position of having to request for an exemption.

The Ministry of Education and Training has worked, where requested, closely with the boards to develop this implementation plan. As far as the Wellington county board is concerned, it has demonstrated a commitment to implementing junior kindergarten by 1997.

If we look at some of the projections from the Wellington County Board of Education, projections over the next three years about enrolment in junior kindergarten—and these are from Alma, Eramosa Public School, JD Hogarth school, John Black school, all within Wellington county, all within your riding, Aberfoyle, Brisbane, Drayton Jr—we're looking, in the first year, 1995, at an estimated enrolment of 402 students.

In 1996, the second year of the phase-in, we're looking at an estimated enrolment of 551 additional students, and in 1997, when implementation is completed by the board, we're looking at another addition of 592 students. This brings a total of 1,545 students. Obviously, they weren't included in the survey that the member took. The parents wish their children to receive the benefits that junior kindergarten can accomplish for their children.

In judging the process, the bottom line is that within three years every child in Ontario will, where his or parents wish, be able to attend junior kindergarten. It's an accomplishment that I'm proud of, and I think it will benefit the children of Ontario and it will contribute to the betterment and the social wellbeing of our province.

**Mr Charles Beer (York-Mackenzie):** It's a pleasure to rise in the debate that our friend and colleague has put forward today on the question of junior kindergarten. I want, at the outset, to say that I have a great deal of respect for the member and I understand the concerns he has expressed previously on this issue. I would simply note as well that we may also, as we craft resolutions, perhaps be getting into that season that we sense is pre-electoral, so the references to other parties and other policies sometimes get brought in in a way.

I want to talk a little bit about what I think was the policy that we put forward where it differs from the present government, but that the place where I think we share the concern that the honourable member has put forward is in the verb "forcing." We had quite a debate on that aspect of junior kindergarten when we were dealing with Bill 4 last spring in the Legislature.

But before doing that, let me just go back with a bit of history here. Over the course of the last decade, and indeed longer than that, since the early 1980s, there has been increasingly, I think, work done which has suggested that providing an educational program in the years prior to grade 1 can be very helpful, can be advantageous to young people.

Indeed the Progressive Conservative government, prior to 1985, had launched a number of projects such as To Herald A Child and the early primary education project, both of which dealt with this issue and were suggesting that we need to look at how we can provide a broader range of senior and junior kindergarten programs. Again, in reports that were done when we became the govern-

ment after 1985 from the project that looked at what would help kids to really have equal opportunity, there were many areas where being able to get into school earlier would help.

1120

I can recall, when I was the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education, going to one area of the province where the socioeconomic level in this particular area was low; many problems in that community. One of the things the school board felt was that if kids could come in for half a day of junior kindergarten, that would open them up to learning and begin to give them a base that would be different from other kids in whose homes perhaps there was more attention being paid to those early years of learning.

The key here is how we go about doing that and to what extent the province, any provincial government, says, "Thou shalt; thou must do that now because we want this to be right across the province in every board."

It's fair to say that in the throne speech of 1989, it was certainly the intention of the previous government that junior kindergarten be implemented across the province. But it's important to recall that in the legislation, the way it was referred to was that the board "may" provide the program, and it was only with Bill 4 that it was changed to "shall." At that time we argued that, particularly in the present economic climate and given the fact that the vast majority of boards were in fact offering junior kindergarten, it would be best to leave it as "may," that there were some real problems that some of the larger boards had around how they were going to implement it. So we voted against Bill 4, not because we were opposed to junior kindergarten but we were opposed to that method of ensuring that it was done.

I think there could be an approach by the government which, through discussion and through financial support, was bringing most of the boards on side and having these programs developed. The issue here, if there is one, is really just the method, the way in which the present government is going about it.

I want to go back to the throne speech of 1989. Some excerpts have been read from it, but let's put this on the record again. In that throne speech on Tuesday, April 25, 1989:

"In this session, my government"—the then Liberal government—"will address the following priorities." The second one was, "Investing in the future of our children by making our education system a more effective springboard to opportunity."

It was the clear sense that junior kindergarten, a better program at that level, would provide opportunity. It was not intended to be simply a babysitting exercise. It was intended to really be encouraging the development of learning among younger people.

Further in the body of the throne speech, as the Lieutenant Governor read it, it said: "Our elementary schools must assist our children to develop basic learning and social skills in their early years. They must build on that foundation by setting high standards for achievement in subsequent years...."



"My government is determined to improve the quality of education for our children. New initiatives will refocus our education system from kindergarten to the end of secondary school....

"The early childhood years are the most important years for acquiring basic learning and social skills. The quality of education that our children receive in these critical foundation years will largely determine their ability to succeed at school and in later years.

"My government believes that children have the capacity to benefit from education at an earlier age. Our education system must build on their natural curiosity and their capacity for early learning.

"My government's long-term vision is to make the opportunity for full-day junior and senior kindergarten available to all four- and five-year-olds.

"As a first step, my government will:

"—Ensure that all school boards offer half-day junior kindergarten for four-year-olds as well as half-day senior kindergarten for five-year-olds.

"—Provide funding for school boards to offer full-day senior kindergarten programs, where classroom space permits.

"These two initiatives will, over the next five years, provide parents with an opportunity to place their children in a stimulating learning environment at an early age."

I don't think there is anything there that I would disagree with. What we have recognized in the ensuing years is just that there are some financial difficulties the government has not been able—and it's probably fair to say no government, given the economic recession we've been in, has been able to provide the kind of funding we were looking at in those earlier years. Hence the need for a more flexible approach.

The government, as has been noted, in the debate over Bill 4 did say, "Originally we wanted this program in place as of September 1, 1994, so we're going to have a period from 1994 to 1997 where it can be brought in and where school boards can come and say, 'We would like an exemption until September 1, 1997.'"

There's no question, though, when you talk with the representatives from the Ontario Public School Boards' Association and from the 20 or so school boards that have been wrestling with how to do this, that they find, with the social contract and expenditure controls, that in terms of priorities they may feel, "Yes, junior kindergarten is something we would like to do, but on a phasing basis, there are other things that at this juncture we believe are more important."

As we go along in this place and as we mandate a variety of programs, I think we really need to step back and try to determine, where do we allow the school board to make some of those decisions? If I were a parent in Wellington county, as I am in York region, which has been having a similar sort of question—I favour junior kindergarten. I think it can do a lot of good things. But I also recognize, when I talk to my school board representatives, that they're saying: "These are the priorities we have. Yes, that one is important, but we would like to

bring it in in a way that we think is more acceptable to the community." We too often have a tendency here at Queen's Park to say, "That's all very interesting, but we're telling you that you're going to do it, and you're going to do it within a set period of time."

That is what is at issue here. When I look at the critical verb in Mr Arnott's resolution, it is that "the government of Ontario should refrain from continuing" and then "forcing all school boards." What has to happen here is to allow the residents of those school areas to determine how quickly they want that program to come into place.

My sense is that if that were an issue, and it may well be an issue in some of these areas in the school board elections later this fall, I think one would be surprised to see that there's much more support for moving to a junior kindergarten program than perhaps some critics feel there is. But by the same token, the wise course—and the course we discussed during the debate over Bill 4 was that this was not the time to be moving the obligation on the board from "may provide the program" to "shall." The debate is not essentially around the value of that program.

I recognize that there are those who feel strongly that there should not be a junior kindergarten, that there is a feeling that the children are too young. As was pointed out, as parents you don't have to send your child to that program. The Education Act makes it clear that education is mandatory from the age of 6. For those who don't want it, they simply don't have to participate. Granted, they are paying taxes and they have concerns about that, but there are all kinds of activities that boards do, that municipalities do and that provincial governments do that people are not necessarily in agreement with. But that's democracy; that's how it gets worked out.

But if the government had continued with the approach that had been in place, where as funds became available—where the province was saying, "We believe you should do this program," there's an obligation on the province to ensure that those dollars are there, and where a school board has a different set of priorities, that school board should be able to determine those priorities. That's one of the big lessons from the recession: that we can't simply be mandating programs that then have to be paid for out of the funds of the local board if we're not prepared in a more effective way to fund it.

With the boards that are remaining, I understand from talking to officials in the Ministry of Education and Training that they believe a lot of progress has been made. A number of boards have different kinds of proposals. I know Grey county is one that came and said, "Could we do some different things in working together with a number of child care and day care operations in providing this program?" To the ministry's credit, it has been sitting down and working with the board on that. Other areas? I know Peel has been looking at some optional ways of providing the program, where it's not necessarily in the school but making use of a variety of child care programs that are in the community.

1130

When we're dealing with these early childhood years,

we want to be able to look at a number of options, because young people at the age of four have different capacities for learning and also different capacities just in terms of what they can take in a more structured setting or in terms of how far they may have to travel. What we've seen in many places is that a number of the rural areas have real concerns about how this program would work, and "Leave it to us to determine what the best way is to bring that in."

It comes back to this question of forcing boards to do it by a set time as opposed to allowing the people in that area to set out exactly what the priority is. I continue to believe, as I look at the program around the province, that it will of itself become something people want to do, because as families look at how it's done in other areas, they see ways in which it can be done so that distance is not necessarily a problem and that there's a flexibility in the kind of programs that are set up, that this is a good thing and that it really can, as the throne speech said back in 1989, help to increase the opportunity of young people for learning and can mean that when they get into grade 1 they will be on a much more level playing field as they go forward with their education.

But in this case, as with a number, the much better approach is to do it in a permissive vein, to work with the boards without a club. The best thing would have been to have left the legislation to continue to be "may" and not "shall." I still think that's the best way to go and I still think that by the end of this decade, if we were to approach it that way, we would probably see junior kindergarten throughout the province.

**Mrs Dianne Cunningham (London North):** It gives me great pleasure to be here today to support my colleague Mr Arnott's resolution with regard to junior kindergarten programs in this province.

I was interested to hear the member for York-Mackenzie speak, and interested also to see that he was the only person who spoke on behalf of the Liberals, because this happens to be one of the biggest issues in the minds of parents right across this province, riding by riding, and certainly is on the minds of all school boards.

He stated that in 1989 the Liberal government of the day wanted to provide an opportunity to young people for learning. I think two major mistakes were made at that time. First of all, there was not public consultation as to how best to do it. The Premier of the day, in the throne speech, made certain that half-day junior and half-day senior kindergartens were promised. In my view, and in the view of many educators and early childhood specialists, they would not say that the school system is the best place to provide learning opportunities for young people right across this province. There are other opportunities, in child care centres and early child centres, and there are many—

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** Do you support universal child care?

**Mrs Cunningham:** I do not support universal child care. I support a learning program for young children, but not universal child care in the context in which the member for Oxford has raised it. I should tell you right now that this province is crying out for public discussion

around early intervention and early learning for young children, ages two to six, probably.

We need it badly. We're discussing it right now in the standing committee on public accounts and we're discussing the efficiency of it. The auditor has made the comment that we are not efficient in our junior kindergarten program in terms of the outcome for early childhood education. We have to look at it in a very different way.

Although the Liberals got this ball rolling, without the public consultation necessary—and this NDP government has not consulted on this issue. As a matter of fact, they referred to the issue of junior kindergarten in Bill 4 as "housekeeping." There was no opportunity for public discussion in Bill 4 on section 170 of the act, section 28. I can only say that the concern was raised by school boards and parents across the province at that time. We had very little time for public deliberation, and this issue, because of its importance to society today, is worthy of public discussion.

The Progressive Conservative caucus does not support the mandating of programs, any programs, without sufficient funds allocated to these programs. The member for York-Mackenzie said two things. He said they promised that these programs would be in place with funding. They have never been in place with funding. If they are in place with funding—I stand to be corrected—the school boards are saying they can't afford it.

Life is priorities, and education is priorities, and if you have to choose them, I would say we have local boards and it's up to them to set their priorities and what they can afford to do. Many of them are well educated and know a better way of providing these kinds of programs. I think we should be listening to them.

I should also say that in January 1994, when the memo was sent out to the school boards stating that "school boards must forward their requests for exemption, together with their plans for the phased-in implementation of junior kindergarten to regional office by April 15, 1994," that related back to the legislation of junior kindergarten. My colleague used the word "forces." It's now forcing by legislation, never before in this province. It was a policy of the Liberal government, but not legislated. Now we have legislation, so the boards are really concerned about what they're going to do.

We know there are 22 school boards that do not have junior kindergarten right now, and as of Tuesday, April 12, three of the 22 boards had not submitted their plans. Those three are submitting their plans to their own boards this week.

All I can say right now is that this is a topic worthy of serious public discussion, and I think those recommendations will be forthcoming from the public accounts committee. There are more efficient ways of providing early childhood learning programs to any child who needs it in his or her own community. Now, as we see the deplorable action that boards are forced into, forcing three-year-olds to go to school all day every second day—that's not appropriate early childhood learning, and that's the decision that rural boards and boards within the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto have been forced into. It's deplorable.



We never looked at how; we never looked at why. All we looked at was a philosophy, and we didn't seriously think about how children could best be served.

**Mrs Karen Haslam (Perth):** In considering this issue, members should never lose sight of the fact that most school boards and a majority of parents have already made a decision for junior kindergarten. Kindergarten, JK and K programs, is widely available in Ontario, and in a sense the vote is already in. Both parents and boards have voted in favour of junior kindergarten by participating in the program.

Just yesterday or the day before, my board put out a press release indicating that it has 169 young people, four years old, registered for the JK program and 273 junior kindergarten students for the upcoming school year.

The early years are crucial because it is in junior kindergarten and kindergarten that the foundations are built for a lifetime of learning. Numerous studies have shown the value of an early beginning in quality programs. I mention Lazar, Hubbell, Murray, Rosche and Royce in 1977, Schweinhart and Weikart in 1980, Lazar and Darlington in 1982, Wright in 1983. Junior kindergarten and kindergarten are the years when young children can develop strong foundations in social, physical, language and thinking skills. Through their interaction with other children and adults they can also develop attitudes that enable them to approach later, more formal schooling with confidence.

Junior kindergarten helps parents also in the important task of providing children with a stimulating environment that encourages discovery and growth. Music and art programs, sand and water tables, exposure to good books and stories—these are some of the features of junior kindergarten programs that build on and enhance the work of parents.

As a parent I used to, with my own children when they were that age, go to the library once a week and bring home 20 books and we read those 20 books, and then we'd go back to the library and we'd bring home another 20. It got so that my three-year-old, my daughter, could memorize and read with me the Madeleine books because she had heard them so often and they were her favourites.

1140

But there are additional programs and additional things that are available for them in a junior kindergarten program. That wasn't available for me at the time. My children were ready for junior kindergarten and it wasn't there. I wish that option had been there for me and for the children. I ended up putting my children into a nursery school, because they needed something more than I could give them at home.

But dramatic changes in society are transforming the world of our children. The media, and particularly television, are changing their attitudes and the way children learn.

Also, because of increasing diversity in family structures and support systems, children no longer enter school with a common set of experiences. In the past most children came to junior kindergarten and kindergarten from the home, and these programs functioned as an

introduction to formal schooling and a bridge between the home and school environments. Today junior kindergarten and kindergarten link schools to a variety of support structures that may include child care, nursery schools, before- and after-school programs and informal arrangements for care.

Children also come to early years programs from a variety of linguistic, cultural, ethnic and racial backgrounds. This diversity enriches the school environment for all children and provides opportunities for them to be exposed to new ideas, cultures and languages.

Increasingly, the days and learning experiences of young children are becoming fragmented. Their lives may be disrupted by moving or changes in family and support structures. It's believed that greater continuity and stability in education in the early years will help children achieve success in the primary grades and beyond.

Continuity and stability may be particularly important for children from low-income communities. For these children, it has been shown that two years in preschool, starting at age three, are more effective than only one year in improving social, intellectual and cognitive development. That was in the Wright study of 1983.

While many children come to school from stable, nurturing environments, some children come to school frightened, hungry or neglected and unable to learn. Many children live in poverty. Many witness spouse, child and substance abuse as well as racial, social and gender inequities. Many also experience tremendous instability in their lives. Their family structures and home environments change frequently and unexpectedly as the result of unemployment, increasing mobility or family breakdowns. Educators can assist these children by finding ways to provide stable environments and provide positive role models in school.

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** Schools will fix all our social problems.

**Mrs Haslam:** No, they won't fix all of their social programs. But I want to reiterate that this is not a mandatory program that mothers must send their children to. It is an option, and there will be people who don't want to take up that option.

**Mr Jackson:** Why? They're paying for it in their taxes. Why wouldn't they?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs Haslam:** When Dianne talks about rural school boards, that's one of the areas where many people are going to be concerned because of transportation issues and young children. But it is an option, and just because there are some people who say, "We don't want it," they shouldn't say to others, "You can't have it." Providing equitable access to junior kindergarten throughout the province is a worthwhile and a valuable goal and one which I am proud to support.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Chris Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton):** It's a pleasure to be able to speak in support of my colleague the honourable member for Wellington's resolution. I would just like to state that we have two objections. And an objection to junior kindergarten is not to junior

kindergarten as a concept; it's to the mandated forcing of junior kindergarten upon all of Ontario as if the needs of Metro and urban areas are the same as of rural Ontario.

I represent two school boards. In Victoria county, they've chosen to have junior kindergarten. In Haliburton county, it doesn't make common sense to have junior kindergarten.

I think there's a consensus in this House that we all recognize: that the ages of zero to five are very formative and that's the basis on which children grow up and that forms their socialization and their education skills. We all share that belief. Where the problem exists is thinking that from Queen's Park we can mandate what's best for rural areas like the county of Haliburton.

The two areas of concern are with regard to the costs of implementing the program, and there are a number of costs. Our grants have been depleted or decreased in the last number of years. The burden on our tax base has grown, and the majority of our tax base is comprised of residential dwellings. We do not have the industrial and commercial base that you have in urban centres, and it's putting a great deal of pressure upon the households in our county.

There are number of costs from the supplies younger children need: the space that's required, additions to schools, teachers, who need training, their curriculum needs to be developed, and transportation costs.

In our county, under the proposed—because it's forced, they were against it, but they were forced to submit a staged process—junior kindergarten will be delivered every other day. Now, the school buses in our area take up to an hour in some cases. There is a tremendous cost if we were to have half-day programs. You can't afford to double-bus the whole county, so the option is every other day, with up to an hour.

Now, it's up to the parents' option whether they go, but as it's been pointed out, they're paying for it in their taxes, and there's also a financial incentive that's forcing working parents with low incomes to go to what's the most affordable. So it's really a misnomer in rural Ontario, in places where working people aren't making very much to start with, to then say: "Well, you have an option. You can pay out of your paycheque and have child care services, or you can get it free and have your child travel on a bus for half an hour." That's some choice.

I also have concerns about the way the program's been implemented. As I mentioned, there's stress on young children travelling great distances on school buses. We've all acknowledged that three-and-a-half-year-olds to five-year-olds are at an age where they learn and they develop their social skills for life. I have a boy who's four and another who's six, and when they're on the school bus, there are a lot of high school kids who will be able to teach them quite a bit, and they'll pick it up.

There's also the potential—and this is the real problem that I see. The smokescreen is that it's for the child and to have everybody have an opportunity to have junior kindergarten for the child's interests. But there have been no criteria established for the ratio of teachers to children.

In the early childhood education program, it's one qualified teacher who's trained in the needs and assessing what that child needs, because they all learn at different rates. Under this program, there are no criteria. It's one school teacher to maybe 20. I read that in Durham it's going to be one to 27. This is in the classroom.

There are also standards in the play yard. Under the ECE program—and the government regulates it and they're licensed—it has to be one to eight. If you're smaller than that, it's one to five, and that goes inside and outside. I see no criteria from the government on how it wants this developed in the school system.

I just want to conclude that this will have implications for the future. Implementing junior K as a mandated program that meets the needs right across Ontario, without regard to local autonomy and local school boards, is not as simple as this government would have us believe, especially in a riding like Victoria-Haliburton, where great distances and time will undoubtedly have serious repercussions. With that, I'd like to conclude.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Gary Malkowski (York East):** It is my pleasure to join in the debate this morning on the resolution that was introduced by the member for Wellington.

I'm actually a little bit shocked by his resolution, because I'd just like to remind him that it was the Tory government which had a report called Report of the Early Primary Education Project. The report was released in 1985, and it was released by a Tory government. I think I would really strongly encourage all the Tory members to read the report and the recommendation that came from that report, which was the implementation of junior kindergarten as an investment for children because it will save costs for social assistance and it will also save costs in terms of providing remedial programs. I would remind the member for Wellington to read that carefully, because it is your responsibility to provide education for the constituents.

I think one thing that is important to remember is that children need to have those early education opportunities for themselves because they need to be able to develop their critical thinking skills, their problem-solving skills, their literacy, not only in the spoken word but in the written word. They need to have that opportunity for the incidental learning. It also provides children the opportunity to develop emotionally and socially, and most importantly, we want to provide them with a violence-free environment.

I think that junior kindergarten is an excellent opportunity. I think the bottom line is that the child needs to be able to build and develop a strong foundation so that they can have a good language base and have good social and emotional development, and this can be done with a wonderful environment. I think it's something you need to know.

1150

Early childhood, the ages from zero to five, is the most critical time of learning. That is the time where we learn the most in comparison to our later years in life. I'm talking about the Report of the Early Primary Education



Project that was released, again, as I said, by the Tory government, and it is an important investment in children that they are provided with the best educational opportunities possible.

You know that technology is changing and the world is changing, and our children need to be ready. They need to be given the opportunity to accept those changes. I think really our point is that our government is being accountable.

We want to make sure that parents have a right to an access for early education for their children so that they can get into the educational system. There are many parents who are frustrated because they do not have that program now, and this is why we are here. I think we are very proud to force the school boards to implement this so that there is the availability.

I think you don't want to misunderstand us when I use that word "force." We're not forcing parents to send their children to school. What we are doing is having the school boards provide the program and then parents have an opportunity to send.

**Mr Jackson:** You are right. You are just forcing them to pay the taxes.

**Mr Malkowski:** Really it is—you're saying that if it doesn't happen, you are forcing them to pay more for social assistance and remedial programs, and that's a problem. I think it shows where your accountability or lack of it is. I would challenge the Tory members to read the report on the early primary education project and it talks about being helpful. I think it would be helpful for the Tory members to understand, and I think we are very proud, in East York specifically, that the board of education has an excellent junior kindergarten program.

I'd just like to thank all the members.

**Mr Jackson:** I'm very pleased to participate in this debate because I believe that my colleague's resolution is very timely and very appropriate. I think it's timely because this government is imposing a deadline tomorrow that all those 22 boards that don't have junior kindergarten have their plans filed or, as the Minister of Education has indicated, there will be financial penalties imposed on school boards that fail to comply. When the member for York East uses the word "force," he really meant the word "force." That's the style of this government.

The reason that junior kindergarten is successful in some jurisdictions in this province is because it has done that based on the academic leadership in some of those boards, in spite of the government not having a management plan. There's no leadership from the Minister of Education or the Minister of Community and Social Services on how to implement junior kindergarten or any early childhood programs in this province.

The proof in the pudding is, there's no funding. Let's call this what it is. This is a grand plan on the part of the Liberals to offload child care onto the local taxpayer, pure and simple.

In my municipality of Halton region, 80% of the four-year-olds in our jurisdiction are in some form of program today, but people are paying. They're paying on the basis of their ability to pay. People who can't pay and are on

social assistance are getting a subsidy because they need to have access to that day care or an intervention program for their child.

That's typical of the Liberals to think that we can con the public into offloading day care for four-year-olds, where the province pays 75% of the cost, onto a municipality like Metro Toronto, where it pays 100% of the cost of educating a child.

In my region, it's the exact opposite: 75% is paid by the local taxpayer. That's what this is all about: a sleight of hand as to who provides services for these children. Because there's no management plan in place, typical of the NDP and the Liberals, because there's no funding in place, we're going to have problems with this junior kindergarten program.

I'll give you a couple of examples. One of the most important elements—and I'm glad the member for York East is with us in the House to hear this and to read this debate, and I'll tell you why—is that in my community of Halton, children getting ready to go into school, and there are a good number of them, need speech and language pathology services.

I heard one of the NDP members tell us about how her three-year-old was reading at a grade one level. We're happy for her child. But what about those children with cognitive deficiencies, those children with handicaps, those children who can't speak the language? Why is it that your government has no program in place to assist preschool children with these language and cognitive skill needs, to strengthen them? A good system would take those children who need help and help them directly, but the Liberals and the NDP have got a system to pick up everybody, whether they need it or not.

In Halton region recently Joseph Brant hospital cancelled its preschool speech-language pathology program. We had 120 children on that program and 90 on a waiting list. These are two-, three- and four-year-old children. I want the members of the government to hear this. When the Ministry of Health cancelled its pre-school speech-language pathology program, they went running to the school board. They said, "We're not getting funded; we're not helping those children." They went running to Comsoc and they said, "We're not providing that support and funding for those children." Those 90 children today still in that program are paying \$80 an hour to the woman who was laid off at Joseph Brant hospital, who walked down the street and opened up her own private clinic. That is the legacy of your government. I ask the member for York East to look into the case of hundreds and thousands of children across Ontario who are now into a user fee system just so they can speak their own language in this province. Yet you feel that we need junior kindergarten imposed at all levels.

I wish we had more time for this debate because there are a lot of issues here to be raised. I want to commend my colleague who has indicated that what the Conservatives believe in for early childhood education in this province is, first of all, true parental choice and that there should be some financial testing, so that those families in absolute need get the support for their child, but not a

universally funded day care system in our schools, which is what this government is proposing. You know it's going to fail, because it doesn't have the support of the people and it isn't properly identified as academically helpful.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** This completes debate. The honourable member for Wellington has two minutes in response.

**Mr Arnott:** I want to thank the members who have spoken to this resolution: the member for Guelph—I want even to thank him—the member for York-Mackenzie, the member for London North, the member for Perth, the member for Victoria-Haliburton, the member for York East and the member for Burlington South.

I am quite disappointed with some of the comments that I've heard this morning. It appears that the New Democrats will not support this resolution and there appear to be enough of them in the chamber perhaps to defeat it. It appears the Liberals have indicated some measure of support.

I appreciate the sincere presentation of the member for York-Mackenzie on behalf of the Liberal Party. I think he demonstrated that there has been some movement on the Liberal Party's part to recognize that the initial policy in 1989 of—you could call it "requiring," but to me "requiring" and "forcing" are synonymous in the case of provincial government downloading something on local government, forcing school boards to adopt junior kindergarten programs.

It appears now that the Liberal Party's position is moderated somewhat, that it would like to work with school boards in a cooperative way, so I think we've made some progress in that respect. But many of the questions that I asked in the context of my initial presentation have not been answered by the government side.

On the question of cost, the estimate we have seen, if as I believe 40,000 kids are in junior kindergarten in the next three years, will be something like \$80 million. Again, we can talk about costs of programs but we must talk about them in the context of the financial situation that the Ontario people find themselves in today and the government increasing the debt, doubling the debt in its four years in office.

It took 120 years to accumulate a debt of \$40 billion in this province, and in four short years of this irresponsible, profligate NDP government, they have doubled that debt. We know that this debt will eventually hold our children back in the future and we must speak against it.

I encourage all members of the Legislature to support this resolution.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT  
(BLOOD-ALCOHOL), 1993  
LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT  
LE CODE DE LA ROUTE  
(PRÉSENCE D'ALCOOL DANS LE SANG)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** We will now deal with ballot item number 47. Are there any members who object to a vote? If so, please rise.

Seeing none, we now are dealing with Mr Offer's motion, ballot item number 47. Is it the pleasure of the

House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

I declare the motion carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for committee of the whole House?

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** Can we put that into the justice committee?

**The Acting Speaker:** Do we have a majority for the justice committee?

All those in favour of going to the justice committee, please rise.

All those opposed for this motion to go to the justice committee, please rise.

The majority is not in favour. Therefore, the bill will go to committee of the whole.

#### JUNIOR KINDERGARTEN

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** We will now deal with ballot item number 48 standing in the name of Mr Arnott. Are there any members opposed to a vote on this motion? If so, please rise.

All those in favour of Mr Arnott's motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members; a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1203 to 1208.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Could all members please take their seats.

We are now dealing with ballot item number 48, private member's notice of motion number 36, standing in the name of Mr Arnott.

All those in favour of Mr Arnott's resolution, please rise and remain standing until named by the clerk.

#### Ayes

Arnott, Beer, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Crozier, Cunningham, Harnick, Hodgson, Jackson, Johnson (Don Mills), Kwinter, McLean, Miclash, Murphy, Offer, Poole, Ramsay, Runciman, Tilson, Turnbull, Waters, Witmer.

**The Acting Speaker:** All those opposed to Mr Arnott's resolution, please rise and remain standing.

#### Nays

Abel, Bisson, Carter, Cooper, Dadamo, Duignan, Fletcher, Frankford, Hansen, Harrington, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Johnson (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings), MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Murdock (Sudbury), Perruzza, Rizzo, Sutherland, Wessinger, Wilson (Frontenac-Addington), Wilson (Kingston and The Islands), Winniger, Wood.

**The Acting Speaker:** The ayes are 24; the nays are 30.

I declare the resolution lost.

It now being past 12 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 today.

*The House recessed from 1210 to 1330.*



## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

PAUL WATSON

**Mr Steven Offer (Mississauga North):** I rise and take this moment to congratulate Paul Watson of the Toronto Star as Canada's first Pulitzer Prize winner for his photograph of a dead American soldier being dragged by a mob through the streets of Mogadishu in Somalia. It is this photograph which prompted the United States Congress to reshape its policy in Somalia.

Pictures such as this push people into thinking about and discussing what is going on in other places. I do not believe that photos such as this are a mechanism to sell newspapers but rather to graphically explore the realities of war and its horrific cost. Photographs such as this do not and are not meant to sensationalize an event but rather to portray as best as can be done the truth of those events.

I wish to congratulate Mr Watson specifically, but also recognize that he is representative of many journalists who risk their lives day to day to bring the facts from far-off places to our attention. We must remember, as we celebrate Mr Watson's well-deserved award, that others not only risked their lives but lost them in their pursuit of unfolding events.

I congratulate Mr Watson on his award, and congratulations to all other media who bring us news from places far removed from where we happen to be.

## CLOSING OF CAMPGROUNDS

**Mr Noble Villeneuve (S-D-G & East Grenville):** This statement is addressed to the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation and also the Minister of Labour.

In eastern Ontario, the St Lawrence parks provide what is possibly the most important focus for tourism in the region, apart from the National Capital Commission. They are also an important source of local jobs. Ever since the former Liberal government announced the closure of two campgrounds and three parks in 1990 and the current government restraints added a further two parks in 1993, there have been efforts to reopen the parks through long-term leases.

These efforts have been only partially successful, with the result that we still have parks whose only purpose in recent years has been to grow weeds and grass. To the NDP, this appears to be a preferable alternative to job creation.

The main reason these parks are growing weeds is not the lack of individuals wanting to operate them. The main reason is the lack of progress from the Minister of Culture, Tourism and Recreation and the Minister of Labour. In order for these parks to be economically viable, they must be exempt from the existing collective agreement of the St Lawrence Parks Commission. The Successor Rights (Crown Transfers) Act and now Bill 40 require existing collective agreements to stay in effect when a new employer takes over the operation of one of these parks. The Minister of Labour can take that exemption away.

The excuse used by both Liberal and NDP governments to close these parks was that they were too expensive to operate. Potential private operators know very well

that's true, and they can do a very good job. I hope the government addresses this before the summer.

## ASSISTANCE TO NATIVE FARMERS

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** Earlier this week I accompanied the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, the Honourable Elmer Buchanan, and the parliamentary assistant for the Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat, David Winninger, to the first nations community of ONA YO TE'A:KA in Middlesex.

For over 30 years, the ONA YO TE'A:KA settlement and local municipal governments have tried to work with federal and provincial governments to resolve drainage problems in communities around the reserve and flooding problems on reserve lands. Until recently, these efforts have not been successful.

Early in our government's mandate, I met, as did Mr Winninger and Minister Buchanan, with the members of the native and non-native communities. The results of those efforts were realized last Monday. The Minister of Agriculture signed a memorandum of understanding with Chief Al Day, chairperson of the Southern First Nations, that provides provincial funding of \$54,250 to conduct a study that will identify procedural mechanisms and funding arrangements that may allow outlet drains to be constructed on first nation territories and the identification of environmental concerns in preparation for a watershed approach to drainage planning.

The minister also signed a memorandum of understanding with the Indian agricultural program of Ontario representative, Mr William Brant. This agreement provides \$120,000 to ensure aboriginal farmers will receive loans for tile drainage under the same terms as other farmers in this province.

I would sincerely like to thank the minister, the first nations and David Winninger for their diligent efforts to make this important initiative work.

## RACE RELATIONS

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I am rising to comment in essence on a television news clip I saw last night about some black and Asian students who were essentially concerned about how the issue of crime can become focused on a particular group.

I think it's important for us in this assembly to recognize that while we should be concerned about crime, victims and, unfortunately, perpetrators of criminal activities come from all backgrounds, and that while we, as legislators, have a responsibility to reflect the public mood, we have a responsibility to lead as well and to be maybe slightly different than the public mood. I think of Edmund Burke's famous speech to the electors of Bristol in that regard.

I think how difficult it must have been to be a black youth in the last few days as people have looked askance because of the Just Desserts situation, and how difficult it must be, for example, for black youth in my riding and I'm sure all across the city.

As we strive in this House to fight crime and make the city a better place to live, and the province, we also have to make extra efforts, it seems to me, to ensure that we do not, as legislators or as the media covering this, allow

that fight against crime to become an attack on any group, but instead be focused on a way to make our neighbourhoods safe and secure for all of us.

#### PROPERTY ASSESSMENT

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** My constituents in the riding of York Mills are concerned that they are paying punitive property taxes and demand that the whole question of inequity in property taxes be addressed.

We need major property tax reform in Ontario. You have done nothing to address this issue since you were elected. The report of the Fair Tax Commission, an \$8.6-million report on this question, is gathering dust. I do not subscribe to all of its recommendations, but it does underscore the need for major reform in this area.

Rental apartment buildings continue to be taxed at a higher rate than homes and other buildings like co-ops and condominiums. The president of the Federation of North York Tenants Associations, Bob Gosschalk, has said "that residential tenants are being discriminated against in a brutal way." He is absolutely correct.

In addition, many owners of new infill single-family homes feel that they too are discriminated against by the existing assessment process which attempts to assign 1940's values to new homes.

Small tenants in shopping malls are in danger of bankruptcy, unless changes are made immediately, due to some recent precedent-setting appeals.

Premier, the Assessment Act needs to be completely overhauled. The tax burden must be distributed on a more fair and equitable basis. This is an issue of grave concern to property owners and tenants alike. It's time for real property tax reform.

#### CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

**Mr Donald Abel (Wentworth North):** Next week the town of Dundas will be honouring its 1993 Citizen of the Year. The selection committee has now completed the difficult task of narrowing the long list of nominees to six finalists. They are Dick Beemer, Amar Chahil, John Farnan, Frederic Hopkinson, Colin MacDonald and Ian Stubbs.

The six finalists were all nominated for their tireless dedication and support within the town of Dundas: Mr Beemer for his work with senior citizens; Mr Chahil for his dedication to the Dundas youth soccer; Mr Farnan for his work with the Dundas Valley School of Art and the local architectural conservation advisory committee; Mr Hopkinson for his long history of involvement with the Air Cadet League of Canada, the Hamilton air show and the Canadian Warplane Heritage Museum; Mr Stubbs for his volunteer work with the Dundas Skating Club and other community activities.

Colin MacDonald, who unfortunately was recently killed in an automobile accident, has been nominated for his many years of involvement in environmental issues.

Dundas is truly blessed to have people who are always willing to give so much of their time to their community. They have, in their own way, made Dundas an enjoyable place to live.

Congratulations to all the nominees and finalists, and

thank you for your kind and generous support. You are all winners.

1340

#### WATER EXTRACTION AGREEMENTS

**Mr Murray J. Elston (Bruce):** Today I want to rise to revisit an issue about which I have presented a private member's bill to this House; that is, the issue of water extraction, particularly from underground aquifers.

Water is the lifeblood of this country, as it is for all of humankind and all of the animals and the creation that exists around us, and it is astounding that we continue to issue bit by bit water permits that allow individuals to basically extract as much water as the permit will allow without understanding the very serious implications of this piecemeal approval of applications.

I want to call on the Minister of Environment and Energy today to institute a moratorium on the issuance of any new permits and to require a review by the Ministry of Environment and Energy of any transfer of the right to take water under any of the existing permits to take water that have currently been given.

The reason is this: There are day by day new examples of the wholesale movement of water from our province to other areas. Some of them have been tracked, but many of them are misunderstood or not understood at all. It is time that we as legislators took the bull by the horns and actually wrestled this issue to a conclusion that all of our constituents will understand.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** Yesterday, in response to the CAVEAT report card on justice reforms, which gave our Premier a failing grade, the Attorney General stated she was moving on several issues on behalf of victims. However, the facts do not support her statements, since the actions of her own ministry officials have slowed down the critical justice reform recommendations before the standing committee on justice.

In June 1991, the Advisory Board on Victims' Issues released its report entitled Victims of Crime in Ontario: A Vision for the 1990's, which contained 13 detailed recommendations for improving services and compensation for crime victims. That report is an indictment of the NDP government's inactivity on victims' rights.

In May 1993, the PC Party under standing order 125 caused the justice committee to consider justice reforms including a bill of rights and a review of criminal injury compensation. Priscilla de Villiers, Debbie Mahaffy and many other victims presented their concerns.

In June of last year, I asked the Attorney General to respond to these recommendations and any implementations to date. To her shame, the committee had to wait seven months for her response, a fact that held up the work of the justice committee.

On October 3, 1992, Attorney General Howard Hampton promised to table legislation for a dedicated fine surcharge fund to help crime victims. Nothing happened.

On June 25, 1993, Marion Boyd pre-empted the work of the standing committee and stated she would bring in



that legislation in the fall of 1993. Nothing happened.

Ontario's the last province to create a dedicated fund for the victims' fine surcharge, in spite of the government's repeated promises. This is further evidence of the government's failing grade.

**Ms Margaret H. Harrington (Niagara Falls):** Violence and victims of crime are uppermost in nearly everyone's mind today. This is a complex issue that we on all sides of this House must work together to address. It affects all of us. Just last week, in the city of Niagara Falls, the mother of a murder victim spoke to a group of women. For many years I have been involved with a feminist group in my city that is concerned about the causes of violence against women.

A lot of factors are contributing to this frightening violence that we are experiencing. We must not use any opportunistic political gamesmanship. This issue is far too serious. Our society in Ontario has always been and strives to be a model to the world of how to live together with respect and tolerance. Our society is very precious to us.

There are no easy answers. There are no quick solutions. I ask all members to look at very carefully and to evaluate very carefully every possible solution to this complex problem and to act here in this Legislature in the most responsible way, and also to encourage and work with the federal level to also act.

#### STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

##### WORKERS' COMPENSATION

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** It has been apparent for some time now that Ontario's workers' compensation system is in critical need of reform and renewal. All across North America, governments are grappling with the need to make their systems of workers' compensation more viable, efficient and affordable.

In Ontario, workers have become increasingly critical of the impact of earlier legislation and of the difficulty of getting back to work. Employers worry that their costs may have to rise beyond what they can afford in the future because of present and future liabilities.

A change that will meet the twin challenges of real fairness and fiscal responsibility is not easy. But it is essential that the change be balanced. It must speak to injured workers and speak to the needs of the broader economy.

A year ago, I asked my Labour-Management Advisory Committee to find areas of consensus around WCB reform and they made substantial progress. Today my government is going to build on that momentum and bring forward a number of measures to fix the workers' compensation system.

We are going to get workers back on the job more quickly, we are going to help older injured workers and tackle the critical urgency of the board's finances.

We expect to see immediate and positive results from these measures. Long-term issues will be turned over to a royal commission for further study, the details of which will be announced in the coming weeks.

It's also my duty to inform the House today that the

board's current chair, Odoardo Di Santo, and its vice-chair, Brian King, will both be stepping down when their terms of office expire later this month.

These gentlemen have served with distinction since 1991 in what is surely one of the most difficult and challenging areas of government. I am personally grateful to both of them. Their successors will be part of a newly revamped structure at the senior levels of the WCB. The new WCB will have a fully bipartite board of directors, with equal representation from labour and management.

Throughout this time of transition, the government will be working with the WCB to establish its strategic and its financial direction.

There will be a transition team involving WCB and government officials, along with representatives from business and labour. The transition team will be headed up by Bill Blundell, who is the former president and chief executive officer of General Electric Canada and now a director of a number of Canadian companies. An interim CEO for the WCB will be appointed in the next few weeks.

Injured workers' pensions will be indexed according to a method known as the Friedland formula. Labour and business both agree that this formula is an acceptable compromise to the current system of full indexation.

There are two important exceptions. Approximately 45,000 older injured workers and family members who are living in difficult circumstances because of minimal benefits will continue to receive fully indexed pensions. Survivors' pensions will be fully indexed and so will the pensions of those who are fully disabled.

In addition, the lifetime pensions of many unemployed older workers will be boosted by \$200 a month, and that will not be subject to social assistance clawback. We are sending a strong message that injured workers will be treated with compassion and justice by the Workers' Compensation Board.

The adoption of the Friedland formula and other changes, including strengthened return-to-work measures, will reduce the Workers' Compensation Board's unfunded liability by some \$18 billion over the next 20 years. That is a substantial reduction, and when combined with other financial and administrative measures, the additional savings will be in the billions over the next two decades.

Our government has believed all along that it was possible to hold the line on employers' compensation costs without reducing benefits, and that's exactly what we've done. The Minister of Labour will table legislation in this House to effect these changes in the very near future.

1350

As to the longer term, I am announcing today that a royal commission will be established with a wide-ranging mandate to conduct a thorough review of the options and alternatives to the current system of workers' compensation in Ontario. I am doing this at the request of both labour and management.

These are the first vital steps towards designing a compensation system that will serve the workers of Ontario into the next century. Getting the Workers'

Compensation Board back on track is in everybody's interest.

Workers need security and justice, and they will get it. Business needs financial stability and will get it. The people of Ontario, rather than somehow sensing that the board is a drain on the province's economic prospects, now have a clear sense of change and reform.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Responses?

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** The first thing I'd like to do is congratulate the Premier for finally firing Mr Di Santo and Mr King, a move that we've been calling for for some time. That's obvious in this statement. What is not obvious is that he must have fired the Minister of Labour as well, because you would have expected Bob Mackenzie to make this statement. I don't know what other job you've got lined up for him, but that's a good decision too, Premier, to fire the Minister of Labour, along with these two.

I don't see anything in here except some smoke and mirrors and some attempts by the Premier to deflect any criticism off to a royal commission into the future. What did he say about rates? Business communities have been hit with 30% to 50% to 75% increases in their rates by this government, by this board, and the Premier did nothing to address that.

The Premier touts his Premier's Labour-Management Advisory Committee process. The management caucus brought out a report which they released. They got together with the labour caucus, got beat up by everybody involved on the government side and had to back off addressing rates or addressing any of these substantive issues, such as expansion of coverage or anything else that all people in this province, including injured workers, are concerned about. You can talk about your PLMAC process as being something wonderful. We all know the wheels fell off it last week, Premier, and you know that as well as I do.

There is nothing on coverage. What happened to the issues? Don't just shake your head. Why didn't you tell us about that? Everyone is sitting here waiting to see some kind of leadership on the issue of coverage from this Premier. We've seen nothing on the benefits; we've seen no guarantees about freezing rates.

As a matter of fact, if you just take one aspect of this statement, where the Premier says, "The adoption of the Friedland formula and other changes, including strengthened return-to-work measures"—let me just ask you, what are those other changes? Are those other changes increased rates to business to pay for what you in fact have no idea what it's going to cost? You have not analysed the impact of the \$200 a month. That has to be analysed. Where is the money going to come from if you're showing any kind of responsible leadership in the area of reform of workers' compensation?

Premier, you know that I've been out on the road for two months on this issue, meeting with injured workers. This system is not only broken, it is clearly broke. This system has no financial leadership coming from the government, and obviously, since you're firing the chair and the vice-chair, you would at least agree with the

opposition in that there is no fiscal responsibility and leadership coming from them.

What about the unfunded liability? We understand that the liability is increasing at a rate of \$2 million a day, seven days a week. It is the mother of all unfunded liabilities in this country. What did you say about the unfunded liability—\$18 billion over 20 years?

Let me tell you, the Friedland formula in year one reduces the unfunded liability by \$3 billion. Don't tell me that you're adopting a formula to save money, because you're stealing that money to pay for your other plans, the other changes that you know about. A billion dollars a year in a system that has, we understand, an \$11.5-billion unfunded liability, and you're going to hide behind a royal commission.

We're talking about December 1995. This government will be long gone. They will be but a footnote in the history of this province. The devastation that this Treasurer has laid on the entire province, on the entire infrastructure, the Premier is now laying at the foot of the Workers' Compensation Board. We were hoping for some real leadership, for some real courage. Address the concerns of the injured workers. Address the concerns of the business community.

I see no reference in this to the medical community. What kind of nonsense is this? The most important group in reforming workers' compensation are the doctors and the chiropractors who work within the system. The Premier has done nothing to address and use that system. This is nothing more than a sad day and a great disappointment on the part of this government.

**Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Waterloo North):** This is an announcement that was long awaited, but I can tell you it is an extreme disappointment to me personally and to the people in the province of Ontario, because I can assure you that this announcement today does not meet the challenges of fairness or fiscal responsibility. It demonstrates a total lack of understanding of the financial crisis facing the WCB.

Indeed, I can tell you that this is only going to further contribute to more chaos and uncertainty and drive business further away from the province. If you put in charge of this province a transition team, if you put in charge of this WCB bipartite government before you even work with the royal commission report, I can tell you it will create uncertainty. This transition is not going to be handled very effectively.

In fact, what's going to happen here is that we're not going to see any reduction in the unfunded liability of \$11.5 billion. Under the figures that you have given us, we are going to see it increasing by the year 2014. Yes, you've indicated we'll save \$18 billion, but it had been projected to be at least \$31 billion, and I don't believe your figure of \$18 billion.

I can tell you that this announcement is not good news for the taxpayers in the province of Ontario. It is not good news for the international community, because you know that the Canadian bond-rating system has indicated that this is going to negatively impact on the bond rating. It's not going to reduce the pressure on the assessment



rates for the employers and this is not going to re-establish a fairer workplace.

There is nothing in here. It is void of any proposal to reduce the real costs of the system. There are no expenditure cuts. You can't continue to pay money to injured workers without looking at reducing the benefit level. We have been suggesting that this should be reduced. We should be reducing it and putting it in line with other provinces like Manitoba and New Brunswick, to 85% or 80%. You cannot continue, as you are doing, to expand the benefits. It will only mean higher assessment rates for employers in this province, who are already, some of them, facing looming bankruptcy.

Until you have in place a plan to deal with the unfunded liability, this announcement is empty, it is totally meaningless. A question I have for you is, does the board have the legal authority to operate under this new bipartite governance model? I do question the bipartite governance model. You are leaving a body in fiscal crisis in extreme peril by changing the governance body and introducing the bipartite process.

Bipartism has not worked in this province. A good example is the Workplace Health and Safety Agency, which was set up by the Liberals. They have been unable to cooperate and they have been unable to reach agreement or a consensus ever since they were established.

1400

What you do by putting bipartitism in place is have the government withdraw and you put the labour unions in charge of determining the agenda in this province. I can tell you that is not in the best interests of the injured workers or the people of this province.

I'm very disappointed that on the bipartite governance body we're going to have representation only by unions. You talk about four people from the labour side. Well, the only people who will be represented are people nominated by unions, and we know that unions don't reflect the wishes of the people in this province. The majority of workers will not be represented on this governance model.

I can also say to you that I question why we would put two citizens on this body. Why would we bring in two people who have no knowledge of the system, two people who have no accountability? I think we need to remember that it's the employers in this province who pay the price of the system.

I would also suggest to you that if you put in a CEO, it should be an insurance executive, someone who has the capabilities.

Finally, in conclusion, as far as your royal commission is concerned, it's too late and there's nothing there that is going—

**The Speaker:** The member's time has expired.

#### REFERRAL OF QUESTION

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** On Tuesday, April 12, 1994, the member for London North (Mrs Cunningham) raised a point of order on the referral of a question during question period from one minister to another. The Minister of Environment and Energy (Hon Bud Wildman), the member for Leeds-Grenville (Mr

Runciman), the member for Parry Sound (Mr Eves) and the member for Brampton South (Mr Callahan) all contributed to the discussion on this issue. In addition, the member for Etobicoke West (Mr Stockwell) rose on a similar point yesterday.

Members may know that one of the first things a Speaker must consider when disagreement arises as to the interpretation of a standing order is how the rule in question has been interpreted by his or her predecessors. In concert with that, the Speaker must review any applicable authorities and past practice.

Standing order 33(f) states: "A minister to whom an oral question is directed may refer the question to another minister who is responsible for the subject-matter to which the question relates."

In reviewing precedents on the referral of questions from one minister to another it is very clear that this has for many years been an accepted practice in this chamber and one in which the Speaker does not become involved. There have been a number of rulings by various Speakers on the very issue of where the right to redirect a question belongs.

In particular, I refer members to a decision on February 9, 1987, in which Speaker Edighoffer stated: "The right to redirect belongs to the minister and not to the questioner. This has been borne out in reviewing Speaker Turner's rulings from 1981 to 1984."

This is but one example of a Speaker's ruling which confirms that the right to determine whether or not a question should be redirected rests solely with the minister to whom the question was addressed.

Finally, I refer members to the 21st edition of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice at page 286, where it states: "It is a long-established principle that decisions on the transfer of questions rest with ministers and it is not a matter in which the Chair seeks to intervene."

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** I invite all members to join me in welcoming to our chamber, seated in the Speaker's gallery, a visiting delegation headed by Mr Dror Zeigerman, consul general of Israel to Toronto. He is accompanied by a number of other important dignitaries. Please welcome our guests to our chamber.

#### ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE COMMEMORATION

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** I believe the House leaders have arranged for an agreed time of statements by me and by the members of the opposition with respect to the commemoration of the 46th anniversary of the foundation of the state of Israel.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is that agreed? Agreed.

**Hon Mr Rae:** Last night many members of the Legislature and my wife, Arlene, and I had an opportunity to attend at Beth Tzedec synagogue a celebration. It was really a wonderful evening of song, of celebration and also of reflection. The consul general, who's here with us today, spoke very movingly and thoughtfully about the mixed emotions that the Jewish community in this province and country feels on this day and as well,

obviously, the very profound mixed emotions that are now at play in Israel itself.

It is difficult for me to find the words to express my own feelings on this occasion. Just a few short months ago, I had the opportunity of representing the province, together with a number of business leaders from many different sectors, to have what really was a wonderful visit to Israel, as well as to Jordan and the West Bank. Other premiers have gone in the past, and there is and has been for many, many years a very special tie between this province and the state of Israel.

I know that the leader of the Conservative Party was there just a few days ago. I haven't had a chance to talk with him about his trip, but I'm sure he experienced, as I did, the sense of vibrancy, the tremendous dynamism of Israeli society, its extraordinary sense of fellow feeling and its outward look to the world, its determination, the great determination of its people, as well as the sense of being on the edge of enormous change, which always brings with it great emotional and personal challenges for all of us.

I'm happy to announce today that later on this afternoon I will be signing a memorandum of understanding of cooperation between the province of Ontario and the state of Israel, which will follow on from the discussions which I had with the Minister of Industry and Trade of the state of Israel as well as with the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister.

It's really an expression of what I think would be a common feeling among many of us in this House that we ought to be finding more ways to express, through our business and commercial relations, what we have already been expressing in terms of our personal lives and work, and that is the increased ties between Israel and Ontario.

Our trade has been small, but it can grow, and in fact there's enormous potential. We saw, even in the short time that we were there, great opportunities, and a number of companies which were with us were able to really expand their own horizons and look to more trading opportunities. We believe, if there is, as we call upon in this agreement, a fuller trade agreement between the government of Canada and the state of Israel, that Ontario, Ontario business, Ontario science, Ontario universities, Ontario research and development, many of our cultural organizations, all will benefit from these associations and from these ties.

So on this day we want to celebrate with the community the 46th anniversary of the founding of the state. As I said last night, the Canadian-Jewish community had a very important role to play in the struggle for independence. All Canadians, through their governments, were supportive and very much involved in the organization of the state of Israel and in the preservation of the peace in 1956, again in 1967, and 1972, and it's been a long, long association we've had between our country and our province and the state of Israel. As Premier, I'm enormously proud of this relationship.

We celebrated here just a few short months ago the signing of the Washington agreement. We continue to want to work with the people of Israel, with those living on the West Bank, with the other citizens of Arab coun-

tries, in effecting a true and genuine peace between Israel and its neighbours, and we will do everything we can in a practical way to help that process.

But above all, it's important for us on this day to express our solidarity with the people of Israel, with the Jewish community in this country, which is such an important part of my own life, and say how much we celebrate this day and how delighted we are to have the consul general and members of the Jewish community with us here today.

1410

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** Today we stand, each of us a representative of our own party, to mark the 46th anniversary of the existence of the state of Israel. I would like to take just a moment to reflect on the achievement of one dream and the hope of realizing yet another.

This day is commemorated and observed by people in every corner of the world, and that is because we are all prepared to celebrate that on this day in 1948 out of the blood and the ashes of the Holocaust there came into being a Jewish state, a national homeland.

This was indeed the fulfilment of a dream held by people who had been living homeless and scattered to the four corners of the earth for over two millennia, the dream of a place they could call their own, a haven for every Jew on earth.

Against what people might have considered in 1948 to have been all odds, the people of Israel have made the desert bloom. They have created a political system that is fiercely democratic, and they have built a modern state renowned for its scientific, its cultural and its social achievements.

I've not yet had the opportunity of visiting Israel, but I understand it to be a country as rich in natural beauty as it is in history and tradition. Yet it is also a place of war and of tragedy and suffering.

Just as we all celebrated the anniversary of the existence of the state of Israel, we all rejoiced this year when a peace treaty was signed by the state of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization, something that not many people ever expected to see in their lifetime, and at last, we all want to believe an end to the bloodshed is in sight.

Yet in the aftermath of that historic event, those who deny and reject the peace process have sought to derail it. Too many lives have been lost as innocent people are killed by those who prefer war over peace, bloodshed over coexistence and death over life. Yet we must be confident that the peacemakers will prevail over the warmongers, and we believe that people of good conscience on both sides want peace and will strive to achieve it.

We have great hopes for the peace process. The creation of the state of Israel has been called the miracle of the 20th century. We believe that the second miracle is within reach now, an Israel of peace.

On behalf of my colleagues in the official opposition, I would like to extend my congratulations to the government and to the people of Israel, and to join with them in



celebrating the 46th anniversary of the achievement of the dream in the proclamation of the existence of the state of Israel.

May we now see the dream of peace realized. Shalom.

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** I too am pleased to rise today to acknowledge the 46th anniversary of the state of Israel. It's also one of those rare occasions when it's a privilege to be able to rise in the House when we have 130 voices virtually unanimous from three different parties in celebrating today.

I extend greetings of course, on behalf of my caucus and my party, to the consul general, Mr Zeigerman, and of course to the vice-consul and members of B'nai Brith and of the Canadian Jewish Congress in the gallery today.

It's a special occasion, as you would expect, for me. I believe you're aware that I've just returned from a hectic trip to Israel and to Rome. I was pleased to be part of a worldwide delegation of people who joined His Holiness Pope John Paul II at the Vatican to acknowledge the Shoah. As a gentile member of the board of directors of the Toronto Yad va-Shem, I was honoured, as was my wife, to participate in this special ceremony in concert with some 7,000 people, many from around the world, at the Vatican.

As part of this trip, I was able to spend four days in Israel. I witnessed myself the beauty of the land and the industry of the people. I met with government officials and spoke with ordinary citizens about the challenges and the triumphs of the state of Israel. I got my best information, as I do in Ontario, from the cab drivers.

Just over a week ago I stayed in a kibbutz very close to the Lebanese border. We toured the very lush valleys of the area and we saw the fields and fruit trees of the area. We visited several of the holy sites, including Nazareth and the shores of the Sea of Galilee. We drove along the Golan Heights and the West Bank.

Travelling down the Jordan Valley was a miracle. It was amazing to see the industriousness of the communities and the success the people had in turning desert into lush, productive farm land.

In 46 years, the state of Israel has faced many challenges, not just challenges of a military nature but the challenges imposed by nature itself. Upon entering the holy city of Jerusalem, I was captured by the beauty, the history and the majesty of the city. My wife, Janet, my son, Michael, and I were personally touched at what we saw at the Yad va-Shem Memorial. We felt deeply honoured to plant a tree in the Peace Forest overlooking the city.

I must say to the Premier that our hosts at the Peace Forest—I insisted on knowing where the tree was that was planted by the Premier of my province in that forest, so the representative from the Jewish National Fund pointed the tree out to me. It is flourishing; I watered it. On behalf of 10 million Ontarians, I watered it with pure water that came from the River Jordan, not something you have in mind.

All the people of Israel deserve to live in peace and security. We know they face much conflict and that

conflict continues. I was pleased to be in Israel while important negotiations with the Palestinians were under way. I spoke with representatives of the Knesset and the Israeli foreign office. I visited New Orient House and spoke with Palestinian representatives.

Finding a negotiated solution to these conflicts will not be easy, but I detected a will on all sides, official and in the streets, that they felt there was a bigger enemy, Palestinians and Israelis, than each other: that they did not want to see the next 46 years for themselves and their children as the last 46 years were. So while it won't be easy, I believe there is a will there to reach a peaceful settlement.

Israel rose from the dark days of the Second World War. Today we celebrate the 46th anniversary. It's a beautiful land. The land flourishes when it is tended with plowshares and pruning hooks, in the words of Isaiah.

Let us pray that the peace process can succeed, because all people can flourish when they know they are secure. Chag Sameach.

1420

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question is for the Solicitor General. Minister, this week I will be holding a conference on Metro Toronto's future, with several hundred people from across Metro attending.

As a part of the preparation for this conference, we sent out a survey on Metro issues and we received something over 2,000 responses. It was very clear in the responses to that survey that the number two issue on people's minds after jobs was clearly the concern about crime and safety, and I tell you that those responses were received before anxiety was heightened by the tragedy of Just Desserts.

Last week you indicated in this House your support for an immediate review of crime and safety issues before the standing committee on administration of justice. I thought we had agreed that we needed to take immediate steps to ensure the safety of the streets of this and other Ontario cities, and yet today we were told by the government House leader that in spite of those words of support, your government is not yet ready to act.

Minister, I say to you again today that the high level of concern about crime and safety means that the public will not tolerate delay. So I ask you, why are you delaying this committee's work? Why is your government getting bogged down instead of being ready to take immediate action to ensure that the people of this city and the cities of this province are safe?

**Hon David Christopherson (Solicitor General):** I am of course aware of the meeting that took place among the House leaders earlier today. I was disappointed to hear that there was some clear disagreement on what was said and what commitments were made. Let me try from the government's point of view to put things back on track.

When the honourable member rose in the House and asked if indeed the government would be interested in a

non-partisan—however, all-party—legislative review of this issue in the interests, as I understood it, of trying to deal with this in a comprehensive way and not to play politics with it, I responded in kind, I believe, in saying that we were very much interested in looking at that, if that were possible.

Since then there have been a couple of very brief meetings. You and I have also spoken on a couple of occasions, very briefly, about this, and also with your critic. There have been discussions with the House leader on the part of the third party. At the last meeting we had, my understanding was that Thursday's meeting would allow us to get a sense of where the parties were in terms of the possible parameters—

*Interjection.*

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** Mr Speaker, I'm very interested in answering the question if the honourable member would please be quiet enough to allow me to answer the question.

I said to the Leader of the Opposition that Thursday would not be a decision-making meeting but that we would move from there. Now I understand there's some question of whether or not today was supposed to be a deciding meeting.

I'm prepared to discuss this further. I see the Speaker asking me to sit down. I want to continue this and will do so under supplementary questions.

**Mrs McLeod:** Disappointment and some sense of disagreement at a committee is not going to respond to the kind of frustration and concern and real anger that people of this province will feel if the government and its legislators refuse to take action. I don't believe that a willingness to take action on these issues that are causing such anxiety for people is in any way playing politics, and I'm somewhat dismayed that that should be a suggestion in the minister's response.

When I meet this weekend with people from across Metro who are talking about making Metro Toronto work, they are clearly going to be asking what government and what this Legislature are prepared to do to deal with their concerns.

I just want to take a moment to tell the minister the sense of concern and urgency that we are hearing from people in response to our survey. A senior citizen from Scarborough wrote:

"I have daughters and granddaughters, and they and their friends are nervous about being out, especially after dark. Many people over the age of 25 have stopped going out at night. They don't feel safe."

A person from downtown Toronto wrote and said:

"Street crime is the most important issue. I've lived near Yonge Street for eight years and I rarely see older people, single women or children walking after 7 pm. These groups perceive Yonge Street as unsafe. Let's change this."

A young woman from the west end of the city writes:

"One killing a week in Toronto is way too much. For children to live their dreams, we must have peace."

Minister, there is no question about the kinds of issues

we need to deal with. They have been raised over and over again. They include community policing, gun control, tougher sentencing and plea bargaining on gun offences. We do not need to wait any longer. Why will you not get the committee under way now? I ask you today if you will commit to putting these items on the agenda of the justice committee and commit to taking action when the committee completes its work.

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** It's the last part of the member's question that indeed has us talking about this. The fact of the matter is that this is not business as usual, where the government would refer something to a standing committee. The honourable Leader of the Opposition said, "Would the government be prepared to consider an all-party, non-partisan...?" I and my colleagues took that to mean that if we were to do this, it would involve a certain level of discussion, negotiation, if you will, so that hopefully there was an agreement on what it was the committee would do. To merely say, "Yes, we're going to do this differently," and not have decided what it is you're agreeing to I don't think is a practical way to approach this.

We did say from the outset that the initial discussions would take place at the House leaders' weekly meeting. That took place today. The question now is, having heard those discussions, is this government prepared—

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** That was not a discussion. You came with nothing today.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for St George-St David.

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** —to respond to the offer, and do we believe there's a possibility to respond in this fashion?

I say to the honourable member that after today—most of us are in our riding tomorrow—the government, my colleagues and I, will review the issues that are before us on Monday, and by Tuesday we'll advise the opposition parties about whether we believe there's enough room to do this. If there is, we'll begin discussions immediately; if not, then let's go about the usual way of dealing with this matter. The opposition will do what it does; the government will press ahead with the responsibilities we have.

But let me end by saying I'm still very optimistic that we can do this, and I sincerely hope that whatever miscommunication took place today does not prevent us from possibly doing this in the way that the honourable member offered earlier this week.

**Mrs McLeod:** The minister's right: This is not business as usual. That's why we raised this issue as we did last week. This is not a negotiating session. This is not miscommunication that's getting in the way. What we called for was a willingness on the part of this government to sit down and talk about immediate action on issues that concern people, that would allow us to relieve people's concerns about the safety of the streets. We talked about urgent, immediate response to people's concerns, and that's what we are calling for.

Yesterday one of my colleagues raised the issue that while the government has restrictions on such things as



driving and tobacco and alcohol and films, there are absolutely no restrictions on the purchase of bullets. I was appalled, quite frankly, not having been in the House yesterday, to realize that it is possible for criminals to simply walk into a store and buy bullets for guns that can be used in illegally obtained guns.

There is no question that one of the issues that needs to be dealt with is the issue of gun-related violence, but we believe there are some very specific and very immediate steps this government can take to ensure public safety.

Our caucus will be introducing a bill today to restrict the sale of bullets to those who own guns legally as certified by a valid Outdoors Card or its equivalent. I ask the minister if he will support this bill to prevent the purchase of bullets for illegal guns, at least as a signal to the public that you are indeed committed to action.

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** There were two issues, and I'll respond to both of them.

The first one was a continuation of the first two questions on whether we would be able to refer a matter to the standing committee in a way that all the parties could agree. I still maintain that this is a reasonable approach we have taken. The alternative extreme of what the honourable member is suggesting, in terms of will we commit to a blank cheque, is like asking you, would you agree to go into the committee and we'll just go ahead and set the agenda and you agree that that's the kind of work we'll do. I would think not.

Therefore, I again commit to the honourable member that the government needs a chance on Monday to review what has transpired today, and by Tuesday we will respond to the honourable member. If indeed it looks like this is doable, because it is a good idea, if we can achieve it, then we will begin negotiations immediately and there should be no need for delay.

On the second part of her second supplementary, let me say that I have reviewed this issue with my ministry officials and I'll comment in two ways: One is to reiterate the comments of the Premier to say that we are very much interested in looking at this issue. I haven't yet seen your bill. Obviously we need to take a look at that, and this issue may again become part of the items we could look at as part of an all-party committee review.

The second part is that the honourable member should know there is real disagreement as to whether we have the clear jurisdictional ability. However, I'm not standing on that and saying that therefore we can't do anything. But I am raising the point that there is a legitimate constitutional question.

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Christopherson:** However, the Attorney General and I and the Premier are prepared to use our offices and the offer from the federal government, that if we need its cooperation, then we will certainly seek that out in as aggressive a way and in a cooperative attempt as we would need to. I wouldn't see that preventing us, but let's acknowledge it's not necessarily ours to decide alone.

1430

#### DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Leader of the Opposition):** A new question again on the subject of people's anxieties and of violence and the failure of this government to take action. In this case, I will pose the question to the Premier.

Representatives of CAVEAT were here yesterday, Canadians Against Violence Everywhere Advocating its Termination, and they were here to condemn your government's failure to act on the recommendations of the Yeo inquiry.

Many of those recommendations focus on how the public can be given greater protection against dangerous offenders and, in the case of this particular inquiry, it was especially to protect people against known violent sexual offenders.

There have been three coroners' inquests in the last two years. All have made recommendations about the way that we handle dangerous offenders in our justice system, and each of the inquests was called to deal with a murder that was the result of a dangerous offender slipping through the system.

In each of the cases of those three coroners' juries, the citizens on those juries put their heart and their soul into making recommendations that would fix the problems that resulted in the deaths of these people, and I ask why you have not acted on the solutions that these citizens put forward in good faith. Why are you not doing everything that you possibly can to protect the people of this province from known dangerous offenders?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I'm going to refer this to the minister responsible, the Attorney General.

**Hon Marion Boyd (Attorney General):** As I indicated yesterday, the concerns that are raised by the coroners' juries and by the CAVEAT report are concerns that we certainly share.

We have taken very vigorous action since we came into government in terms of the whole issue of how to best deal with serious interpersonal crime. A lot of the action that's taken place, the revamping of our court system and so on, has been so we can focus our resources on ensuring that those serious crimes are met.

The speaker will recall that when we came into office the backlog of cases had created a situation called the Askov crisis, which in fact was a huge backlog of cases, and there was a Supreme Court decision that the delay that was being caused was unconstitutional. As a result, many court cases were lost because of the unreasonable delay. We took action to change that, and we have turned that around. Court cases are now proceeding appropriately, and we are doing what we can.

The other issue is the dangerous offender designation. This government is very proud of the vigour with which we have instructed crown attorneys to look at the application for dangerous offender situations, and we have indeed been very successful in our applications before the court.

**Mrs McLeod:** There are some very specific steps that each of the coroners' juries have indicated can be taken

right here in the province of Ontario, and quite clearly, Priscilla de Villiers believed that this government can take specific steps. That's why she came here yesterday, and that's why, remarkably, the chief coroner of the province of Ontario came here with her.

The coroner's inquest into the Yeo case simply recommended, and I take just one specific recommendation, that this government study the implementation of an Ontario central registry for violent sexual offenders. I ask the minister, what possible reason can you find for not at least proceeding with a study of whether this would help and how it could be made to work?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** Along with the attorneys general across the country, this whole issue of how to track dangerous and high-risk offenders is of concern to all of us. The member will be well aware that the kind of registry that's suggested raises very serious constitutional issues, and we all have to be mindful of those.

At our recent federal-provincial-territorial meetings, we very clearly indicated our willingness, all of us, a unanimous willingness, to work with the federal government to find ways within our constitutional responsibilities that we could track dangerous and high-risk offenders. We pledged to work together with the ministers of health of our various jurisdictions to look at how the mental health provisions could work together with the justice provisions to ensure that the kind of tragedy that was the subject of that inquest could not happen again.

**Mrs McLeod:** I just don't think it's good enough to go on telling people that we are meeting and discussing or that there are some bureaucratic reasons for not acting or that in fact it may fall into the jurisdiction of another government. It's quite clear, once again, on this issue that there are steps which this government can take.

The Yeo inquiry recommended that you study the implementation of this kind of a registry for the province of Ontario. The Stephenson inquiry recommended that a national registry for known violent sex offenders be established. The Kerr inquiry this week recommended a central registry for all violent psychiatric patients in the system.

Clearly, there is an overwhelming consensus that there is a problem and that this problem needs to be fixed and it is within the jurisdiction of the province to take action on at least a provincial registry. We simply cannot sit back and wait for another inquest into another brutal murder or another sexual assault in order to act. We need action from this government now.

Minister, I'm urging you to act and I ask, are you not prepared, as a first step, to move towards the establishment of a provincial registry for violent offenders?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** I'm astonished that the Leader of the Opposition would call constitutional concerns "bureaucratic delays," quite astonished.

We have looked at it and we would say and we would urge the Leader of the Opposition to recognize that we, particularly, as the province of Ontario, with the kind of part that we play in the national prison system and the fact that most people who would be in this category of high-risk offenders would have been convicted and

assigned to a federal prison, are in a situation that is very unusual compared to most other jurisdictions. The member is also aware that the federal prison system moves prisoners from province to province.

The only thing that makes sense, as the Stephenson inquiry showed, was a national register that in fact would deal with this on a national level. I have said to the member that our province has committed ourselves to working with all of our counterparts to achieve what we can that is going to meet the test of constitutional validity. We continue to do that. We share the concern but we do not have the facile kind of solutions that would ignore the constitutional reality that is now Canada.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** New question, third party, the honourable leader of the third party.

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

*Applause.*

**Mr Harris:** That's all right; go ahead.

*Applause.*

**Mr Harris:** I hope the leader of the Liberal Party is aware of how many times we asked the same question of Ian Scott that she's asking today to the Attorney General.

#### WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the Premier. Concerning your announcement today on the WCB, the management members that you appointed to your advisory council on WCB point out that the unfunded liability of the WCB before today's announcement would reach \$52 billion by the year 2014. With today's changes, their calculations say the unfunded liability of WCB by the year 2014 will be \$34 billion, \$3 billion more than what you said it would be yesterday and \$21 billion more than what you have told us today with your announcement. This isn't me, Premier; this is the people you appointed, the management members, to your advisory committee.

Who do you think the bond raters will believe—you or those who are paying the premium rates that you appointed to advise you?

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I can tell the honourable member that during all the discussions that I had with the management members of the board, the management people who are on the advisory committee, the figure that they agreed with in terms of the actuarial assumptions—all of us were working from a common set of actuarial assumptions—was that unless something was done, the impact of doing nothing would be a potential liability of \$31 billion.

1440

I would say to the honourable member that it is clear to me that this government has taken steps which will have a major impact on future unfunded liability, will have a major impact on the unfunded liability this year of close to a \$1-billion immediate reduction. I would say to the Leader of the Opposition, during the entire time that he was in office, the unfunded liability of the Workers' Compensation Board didn't come down by a cent. It kept going up. It kept going up during the 1980s. It went up



under Bill Davis and it went up under David Peterson, and under the New Democratic Party government it's going to come down. I believe that everyone will see that clearly and that that in fact is the case and that is in fact true.

**Mr Harris:** By way of supplementary, let me say that I think it is disgraceful—

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** We want to hear Mike's math. Let him say it. Come on, say it, Mike.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for Downsview.

**Mr Harris:** —that the member for Downsview is even allowed in here.

*Interjections.*

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** You're insulting. Withdraw that remark.

**The Speaker:** Would the member for Yorkview please come to order. The leader of the third party with his supplementary.

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Minister of Finance):** No explanation?

**Mr Harris:** The voters can withdraw him if they want; that's the way it's done around here.

My question is to the Premier. The original goal, Premier, of your Labour-Management Advisory Committee was to reduce the unfunded liability of the WCB to zero by 2014. That was the goal: labour-management. Let me agree with you that the fact that the unfunded liability increased under Bill Davis, David Peterson and you to date is disgraceful and wrong. All you've told us today is that something's going to happen in the future, and any time we've heard that from you, it's never, never, never happened yet.

But given, Premier, that the goal was zero, can you explain to us today that the unfunded liability, after your announcement, will be \$34 billion, according to some estimates of those who are paying the bills, and in your best-case scenario \$13 billion, that you have presented to us today, by the year 2014, assuming your estimates are anywhere close to actuarially sound.

I would ask you, Premier: What happened to the only acceptable, achievable goal that was going to bring some sanity to this whole run-amok organization? What happened to the goal of zero unfunded liability?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I want to just say to the honourable member again—and this isn't a matter of numbers but it is a matter of clear principles—as soon as the Friedland formula is introduced, the impact on the unfunded liability—and as soon as the cost of the \$200 increase is worked in, that works out to an \$828-million reduction in the unfunded liability as of 1995. That is close to a \$1-billion reduction, and that's without dealing with the return to work and without taking into account the other changes that the board can make.

So I would say to the honourable member, and I would challenge him directly, all rhetoric aside, I am telling him, this government is putting itself on the line. We are asking people to make a sacrifice; we're asking people to give. People are giving up something which they now

have in terms of their potential future pensions in order to help the board out with a problem. And if you don't recognize that, and there are some employers who don't recognize that and there are some business people who don't recognize it, I think the common sense of the world will recognize that this is the only government that's had the guts, and the workers of this province are prepared to do something in order to help to reform the board. If you don't think that's valuable, I think you're sadly, sadly mistaken. I think that's very valuable.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The leader of the third party with his final supplementary.

**Mr Harris:** I think the bond-rating agencies, Premier, will judge the actions not by how loud you yell and scream, but as they always do, by results. So far their judgement on you has been zero, negative, no good.

Today you announced that 36,000 people will have their WCB pensions increased by \$200 per month for life. This decision will add \$8 billion to the system by the year 2014. Quite frankly, Mr Premier, while this may be a justifiable social expenditure, I would ask you, why do you lay this \$8 billion on top of the payroll tax of the WCB employers when that pot of money is already \$12 billion in debt today and, according to your best estimate, by the year 2014 will be \$13 billion in deficit? Why do you take that \$8 billion out of that pot, which has no money in it, whether it is a justifiable social benefit or not? Why do you do that?

**Hon Mr Rae:** The honourable member is using numbers and arguments which are simply wrong. I would say to him very directly that the net impact on the unfunded liability to 2014, including the \$200 increase, with the Friedland, is \$18 billion.

**Mr Harris:** I didn't talk about Friedland.

**Hon Mr Rae:** You can't talk about one without the other. Your member said: "We think all the benefits should be cut. We think all the workers should get less. That's what they've done. That's what they've done in Ottawa with unemployment insurance. We think that's right." That's what she said. That's the policy of the Conservative Party.

I'll tell you what the policy of the NDP is. We say to workers and management that workers will give up a little bit of something in terms of future earnings on the indexing formula, we'll change the formula, but you'll have some protection. We'll help the workers who are hurting the most. We'll improve the return to work. We'll get the WCB on a really businesslike basis in terms of how it operates, and we'll ask that people cooperate and work together instead of simply sticking it to the workers.

I wasn't elected Premier of the province of Ontario to stick it to the workers. I was elected to bring people together, and that's exactly what I'm trying to do.

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Mr Speaker, on a point of privilege: The Premier mentioned principles. I want to say to him that the principles of the New Democratic Party on workers' compensation were clearly stated during the debate on—

**The Speaker:** The member does not have a point of

privilege. Would the member please take his seat.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Would the member for York Centre please come to order.

The leader of the third party with his second question.

**Mr Harris:** I agree with you, Premier. You weren't elected to stick it to workers and that's why they're so disappointed with you over the last three and a half years.

My question is to the minister responsible for women's issues—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** I must caution the member for York Centre that if he refuses to come to order, he will be named.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** If the member continues to refuse to come to order, he will be named.

The leader of the third party with his second question.  
1450

#### JOBS ONTARIO

**Mr Michael D. Harris (Nipissing):** My question is to the minister responsible for women's issues. The one thing, Minister, that your government repeatedly hails as an attempt to create jobs in this province is Jobs Ontario. The majority of this money, billions, is directed at infrastructure. I call it a good infrastructure program, but your government calls it the job creation program. This is the bulk of your job creation program. This is where the billions of dollars are being spent.

Minister, only 5,000 women in Ontario in total work in that construction industry. That's less than 2% of construction workers, or that's less than 0.002% of the women in the workforce today. Therefore, the only effort that your government has made to create jobs in this province has clearly failed to help women.

As the minister responsible for women's issues, I would ask you this: How can you justify to the 224,000 women in Ontario who do not have a job today that your job creation plans and your billions of dollars have virtually ignored them?

**Hon Marion Boyd (Minister Responsible for Women's Issues):** The member is quite mistaken in one of his first statements, and that was that the infrastructure program is our only job creation program. His concern is one that we share in terms of the construction industry, the lack in spite of very repeated efforts by government to try and get entry for women in non-traditional occupations. There is no question that there is a substantially higher proportion of representation within those construction industries, and we are working with the industry to try and ensure that women are more welcome. But that is only one of the programs.

If we look at the Jobs Ontario Community Action fund, we have named women as one of the community-of-interest groups. We have specifically geared the program to try and help women as partners in that economic development plan to create jobs for themselves and others.

**Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington South):** Name them unemployed.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** The member for Burlington South, please come to order.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** Similarly, the Jobs Ontario Training is geared primarily at people who are on social assistance. We know that the vast majority of recipients are women, and so women are very much the target of that job creation program; our work in the child care area, our work in the long-term care area, all of those jobs.

**The Speaker:** Would the minister please conclude her response.

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** Above all, the employment equity provisions, which that party voted against, are primarily directed at ensuring that women have equal representation in the workforce.

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** Stockwell for leader.

**The Speaker:** Would the member for Yorkview please come to order. The leader with his supplementary.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Stockwell for leader.

**The Speaker:** I asked the member for Yorkview to come to order. The leader with his supplementary.

**Mr Harris:** Minister, your government daily has talked about how you're creating jobs, that you are taking a proactive role, that you're a job creation government in the middle of this difficult time in Ontario. There is \$4.8 billion being spent on infrastructure, all called job creation: Jobs Ontario, jobs now. Could you tell me how many dollars are being spent, targeted towards women in this province, who are equally as unemployed as men?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** No, I can't give him a dollar figure because of course all our job creation programs are done in conjunction with partners who make decisions that we don't make. What we do say and what we have made clear to those partners is that the employment equity provisions that we have clearly stated and put into law are extraordinarily important factors in achieving viable partnerships. So when we look at what is happening in each field, we are very clear with our partners that we take this seriously and that we want to see some real results.

The member is quite right that the traditional inequity that women have faced, which this government has attempted to address and indeed we believe our legislation will address and will redress over the next few years, is a situation that was allowed to go on and on by previous governments, even though those of us in the women's movement had pointed out this problem time and time again, so the member is hardly in a position to criticize this government for its action, which is much more proactive than any previous government.

**Mr Harris:** What I am talking about is what you are telling us every day: your extraordinary interventions and job creation programs. That's what I am talking about: \$4.8 billion. I hear it every day, announcement after announcement. I asked you how much was being targeted towards women. You didn't give me an answer.

Can you explain to me why it is that, not with the



ordinary programs but with this extraordinary spending that you're targeting and calling job creation, 95% to 98% of the money is being targeted to men and less than 1% or 2% is being targeted to women?

**Hon Mrs Boyd:** We simply don't accept the figures the member is giving. We want the member to recognize that in our tendering process for the kinds of construction jobs we are doing as a government, where we are tendering, we are requiring employment equity provisions in terms of our tenders. Many of the programs that we have are specifically geared to areas where we know women's employment is done.

The member is completely ignoring the issues of job retention within the public service. The 40,000 jobs that the social contract has saved are primarily women's jobs.

It is absolutely unconscionable for this member to suggest that our policies are not working, along with our laws, to try and provide better employment equity for women.

#### WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

**Mr Steven W. Mahoney (Mississauga West):** My question's to the Premier regarding your announcement today on the supposed reforms—

**Hon Floyd Laughren (Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance):** Ah, now we'll find out what the Liberals will do.

**Mr Mahoney:** You will very soon—supposed reforms to the Workers' Compensation Board. The leader of the third party, Premier, has suggested that you should somehow magically get the unfunded liability from its current level of somewhere between \$11.3 and \$11.5 billion down to zero, without suggesting how that might be done.

The financial people I've met with over the past couple of months have said that they don't believe it's possible, that it's simply too far out of control, but that it is indeed possible to bring some form of fiscal responsibility to the board and that it is possible to bring some plan, some financial plan, that will show business and injured workers some long-term sustainability. That would not attain zero, as the leader of the third party is dreaming, but it would put the plan on some form of good footing.

I have a question, Premier: I'd like to know if you would do something to ensure that the unfunded liability does not grow any further than it already is while the new board that you put in place will have an opportunity to develop some fiscal responsibility.

Will you agree, Premier, to instruct the new board that you've announced today that it should not expand coverage to include occupational stress, and will you also instruct that new board to invoke a freeze on rate increases to business until at least your new—what do you call it?—commission has had a chance to report? Two things.

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** I can say to the honourable member that I feel very strongly that it's important for us to send some very clear messages to the board about what should and should not be done over the next while. I can tell him that it's my firm view, and I hope and expect that this will be reflected in various cabinet—and

the statements with respect to the future of the board. I fully believe that any issues about extension of coverage, and I also believe that questions about extension of coverage in terms of other employees who might be covered including those in the financial sector and others—the government has decided that we will not simply do that unilaterally, that we will ask the royal commission for its view and we will establish a process where the pros and cons can be clearly put in front of a royal commission. We will not be expanding coverage.

In answer to the second question, I firmly believe that what we are doing and proposing must be done within the current assessment rating levels that are now in place. I don't think assessment rating levels should be increased at all.

1500

**Mr Mahoney:** I truly do appreciate that, because I believe the solution to the reform of the WCB is much less of a partisan issue than perhaps all of us in this place make it from time to time. I want it absolutely clear that I include myself in that, but I include all of us in that.

I want to make it absolutely clear that the board that you have talked about in your new, restructured WCB is not really much of a change. You're talking about four labour appointees, four management appointees and two citizen appointees, I guess you call them, who would be recommended by management and labour. With the recognition that the two citizens would be new—they're coming in as a result of an agreement between the labour and the management caucuses—I fear that the domination of organized labour in the makeup of this board will continue to make it very difficult for a balanced decision approach to be put forward by the board.

I want your undertaking that you will instruct the new board on the two issues that I asked you about, that you will make it absolutely clear that you will instruct your Labour minister to make it absolutely clear that this government, at least until after the royal commission has had a chance to report, will reject and will roll back any rate increases and will, without any question, refuse to allow the new board to come in and through some pressures brought to bear by the OFL or others—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member please conclude his question.

**Mr Mahoney:** —expand coverage. Will you absolutely, unequivocally today give us that assurance?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I can tell the honourable member that the cabinet has made a decision that we will not extend coverage until or unless, depending on the advice that we or another government receives from the royal commission. The royal commission is not expected to report until late 1995 or early 1996, and I have advised members of the PLMAC, labour and management, of that fact. I've told them that is not part of any approach or any package that has the approval of the cabinet. It was a difficult discussion.

I want to just say, in answer to another part of the member's question—

**Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (York Centre):** Read what Bob Rae said.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —that I believe there are a couple of—

**Mr Sorbara:** Read what they all said. I am just encouraging them to read Hansard.

**The Speaker:** The member for York Centre.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —important changes which flow in terms of the board structure, but more than the board structure, the management structure. I can tell the honourable member that it is my view—

**Mr Sorbara:** Those who fail to read history are destined to repeat it, federally as well.

**The Speaker:** The member for York Centre is to come to order.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —on the basis of the experience which we have had and on the basis of the experience which other boards have had, that it is extremely important that there be one CEO of the board who is somebody who has the confidence of all the parties to the system, including the confidence of the business community and the confidence of the government as well as the confidence of the injured worker community and of the labour community.

It's going to be very hard to fill that position with the right person, but I believe we must and can do it. I believe it's extremely important that this person be clearly empowered to make the kinds of administrative and entrepreneurial changes within the board that are going to be required to make that internal structure happen. There has to be a cultural change within the board—

**The Speaker:** Could the Premier conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —and in order to do that, we have to empower the person to do that. That person will be the CEO of the board. There will be a chair whose responsibilities will be broader in terms of communicating with the public and so on, but the real administrative authority has to lie with one person. I certainly—

**The Speaker:** Would the Premier please conclude his response.

**Hon Mr Rae:** —think we need to look at the experiences that we've had with other bipartite organizations in assessing where there have been difficulties. I've been very candid in my discussions with people about that and I'd be very happy to hear—

**The Speaker:** The question's been answered. Would the Premier please take his seat.

#### HOMES FOR THE AGED

**Mr Charles Harnick (Willowdale):** My question is to the Premier. Today, the Cummer Lodge home for the aged has been described in a headline in the Toronto Sun as being "repulsive."

**Hon Bob Rae (Premier):** A headline in the Toronto Sun!

**Mr Harnick:** Well, this may be a joke to the Premier. But I tell you, Mr Speaker, when he was in the opposition, if a home for the aged had been described in any newspaper as being "repulsive," as Mr Ian Scott would say, "You would have had to take the Premier and scrape him off the ceiling."

Premier, this home for the aged has been described as "repulsive." I have been writing to your government, and I've written as far back as June 1992. This nursing home or home for the aged does not accommodate wheelchairs through doorways. It does not have private or even semi-private rooms. It positively reeks in terms of the smell, and I will tell you that it's not safe.

Premier, I want to know if you will spend an hour one afternoon and come with me to take a look at this nursing home so that I can sit down with you and come up with some plan to deal with this particular problem. I hope you won't refer it, because if you don't get involved, this particular home is going to remain like this for years and years to come. Will you take me up on the offer and come and visit this place with me?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I'd be delighted to do that. I think in my last 20 years I must have visited 100 or 150 nursing homes and homes for the aged. I'd be more than pleased to do so. I've already visited it on a number of occasions.

I want to say to the honourable member that the capital project Cummer Lodge is a priority on the Ministry of Health's 1994-95 capital work plan. We've indicated that as clearly as we can to Metro. I would remind the honourable member that Metropolitan Toronto runs the home. It is one of the wealthiest municipalities in the country.

I would say directly to the honourable member that we're happy to work with Metro on this project to make sure that the renovations that are required are done. But I want to say to him very directly, I'd be more than pleased to visit the home.

**Mr Harnick:** I would be pleased to set up that appointment with you at any time that you're free. You're much busier than I am, so whenever you're available, I'm ready to go. But I don't want to delay this for any longer than we have to.

But I will tell you, Mr Premier, that Metro says it can't deal with this, or it won't deal with this, because it has some notion that your government is going to do something—

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** They won't deal with a lot of things, Charles.

**Mr Harnick:** The member for Downsview doesn't care about the Cummer Lodge, and I'm sorry about that.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order.

**Mr Harnick:** Metro does not want to deal with this because it has some notion that your government has a long-term care project up its sleeve that's going to be announced at any moment. They say, "Well, why should we start investing money in this if the Ontario government's going to be looking after it anyway?"

All that's happening is that the people who live in this positively repulsive home are caught, as two governments shadow dance with one another. Unless you're prepared to show some leadership and to take the bull by the horns and deal with this problem and indicate to Metro the direction that you're going in—

**The Speaker:** Would the member complete his question, please.



**Mr Harnick:** —so that Metro can deal with it, the people are nothing but pawns in your hands.

1510

Will you please come with me and begin some discussions with all of those who are involved so that we can repair this positively offensive lifestyle that my constituents are forced to endure?

**Hon Mr Rae:** I just say to him very directly that I'm of course busy but I'm not too busy, and I'm happy to do it. We will work out a time to do it. I just want to say to him very directly and say to my friends in Metropolitan Toronto, we have absolutely no desire to get into any kind of a jurisdictional battle on this question. We continue to act in good faith. We kept up the transfer payments. We participated fully in the infrastructure program. We are trying, even within our limited means.

Metro has an AAA credit rating. As you know, ours is a little less spectacular. I would say to the honourable member, it is important for us to work together, and we are prepared to work in partnership with Metropolitan Toronto. I can only say that when Metro Councillor Maureen Prinsloo said, "It's horrible to use people as hostages," I couldn't agree with her more, which is why I have difficulty accepting the decision that Metro council made.

#### PLANNING APPROVAL

**Mr Norm Jamison (Norfolk):** My question today is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Over the last little while, I have been increasingly hearing complaints from many of my constituents about the planning process. Coming from rural Ontario, this process, I can say, simply is not working the way that it should. They are frustrated and angry about the process that, number one, produces poor results, and which, in their minds, is characterized by red tape, lengthy delays, and I'm talking about the long time spans it takes to get appeals heard.

I understand that the Sewell commission looked into the Ontario planning process, and subsequent to their report, the minister has instructed—I hope you have in any case—your ministry to review the Sewell commission's recommendations. Minister, what is the status of your ministry's review into this extremely important issue?

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** The member raises an important point. The planning process and the planning decisions that are made have a long-lasting effect on people and businesses in this province. At the time that—indeed long before this government came to power, the planning process was seriously questioned as to its integrity, as to its efficiency or lack of efficiency, and the problem of openness in the planning system was seriously questioned by people on all sides of all issues.

I'm pleased that the Sewell report has managed to galvanize our public's focus on where we should be moving in the planning process to make it more responsive to local needs, to make it more responsive to environmental concerns and to make it more responsive to the economic priorities of this government and of this province.

**Mr Jamison:** It has been my experience over the last four years to have constituents come into my office and, rightfully so, complain about the process and the length of time in getting to the OMB. This situation has gone on for years and years, and there is extreme need to change that particular process.

I can tell you I'm very supportive of making constructive changes and acting on the recommendations made by the recent Sewell commission, particularly those that protect the public interest, reduce time in delays and provide for economic growth. It's my opinion that there's a tremendous amount of economic growth being curtailed by virtue of the cumbersome way in which the old system works.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Could the member place a question, please.

**Mr Jamison:** Mr Minister, what is your ministry doing in these particular areas?

**Hon Mr Philip:** The Sewell commission clearly deals with that problem, and part of the problem is dealing with the responsibilities of differing layers of government and clearly defining the approval process so that the duplication and the delays are no longer a problem. It's a matter of ensuring that each of us knows what our responsibilities are and that we can work to carry them out.

I can assure you that my ministry has already delegated planning responsibilities to municipalities in Bill 40. We are delegating more responsibilities in the planning process right now as we move along, and we intend to have more decision-making at the local level as we implement the Sewell commission report legislation.

#### CHILD CARE

**Mr Charles Beer (York-Mackenzie):** My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Before the election of your government and indeed since taking office, you have made two clear promises to the child care community: first, that there would be fundamental child care reform and, second, that there would be legislative recognition for early childhood educators. This morning at a packed press conference here at Queen's Park, the child care community delivered its verdict and said that you had broken faith with both of those commitments.

My question, Minister, is very simple, and it is this: The child care community has said that federal funds are available for child care reform and that all Ontario has to do is ask. The federal Minister of Human Resources Development has said there are federal dollars available under the strategic initiatives fund for child care. Have you put forward a project to the federal government under that fund, and if you haven't, why haven't you?

**Hon Tony Silipo (Minister of Community and Social Services):** I appreciate the question because it gives me a chance to tell the honourable member very directly the answer is yes, we have asked. We asked on January 10 when I met with Minister Axworthy. We asked again on February 14 when I met again with Minister Axworthy. I asked again on February 28 when I met with Minister Axworthy, and we recently sent a formal proposal to him.

I'm waiting to hear the answer from Mr Axworthy.

**Mr Beer:** Clearly information is difficult to ascertain all over the place on this issue, because again and again what we've heard is that you haven't asked.

In trying to determine specifically what it is that you have asked for, is it in relation to the Job Link program, which was going to be a key component of your welfare reform? If that is what you have asked funding for, that is fine as far as it goes, but that is a very limited program.

My question then is, what specifically have you asked for? Is this part of a major revamping of our child care system so it will no longer be simply a welfare program? Is this going to lead us to real and true reform so that we recognize the economic importance of child care as part of our whole attempt to get out of this recession? Minister, what have you asked for?

We need to know specifically, because as far as the child care community is concerned—

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Would the member complete his question, please.

**Mr Beer:** —and the minister's office of human resources, there has been no request for funds for child care reform.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** On each of the three instances that I've outlined, I discussed with Mr Axworthy very directly both requests for funding from this government in terms of the relationship between child care and Job Link, and I can tell the honourable member that a formal written request to supplement those discussions is now in front of the federal government, in front of Minister Axworthy, and I am awaiting anxiously a response to that request.

We are also working on finalizing a formal written request to add to the request that I've discussed directly with Mr Axworthy on the broader issue of supporting the reform initiatives that we have put forward and to which we remain very much committed as a government, which would help us to move the child care system from a welfare-based system to a public service, something that we believe in very strongly and something that we believe we need to continue to work for.

I'm delighted to say to the member that I will look forward to a positive response from Minister Axworthy on that request as well, and any help that he can give us to get a positive response sooner rather than later will be greatly appreciated.

1520

**The Speaker:** Could the minister conclude his response, please.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** I will also tell the member that, as I leave this Legislature this afternoon, I'm going to a meeting with the various child care advocates to outline to them exactly what we are prepared to do—

**The Speaker:** Order. Would the minister please conclude his response.

**Hon Mr Silipo:** —and what we do will be dependent on some further help that we can get from the federal government, and that is also part of the commitment that we want to get.

## HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** My question is to the Minister of Transportation. In announcing the Highway 7 project, the Premier said that the private financing would save taxpayers' money and get the road built quickly. Now you're saying that government financing through the Ontario Transportation Capital Corp will reduce the cost of the highway. Are you just incompetent or are you hiding something, specifically debt, for example, in the capital corporation? In view of this, will you file all of the details of the competitive proposals?

**Hon Gilles Pouliot (Minister of Transportation):** The member repeats what the marketplace has been addressing vis-à-vis borrowing money to build the 407 over a period of six years using the Ontario transportation corporation as a facilitator. The member should know, by way of an answer, that the possibility, the capacity to borrow from Ontario incorporated, from the government here, is better than anyone else.

**Mr Turnbull:** That's not what the Premier said when he made his announcement.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** When the member looks at the long-term bonds and he compares benchmark debentures of 25, 30 or 35 years—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Order, the member for York Mills and the member for Etobicoke West, please come to order.

**Hon Mr Pouliot:** —he will see that those benchmark debentures of 25, 30 and 35 years, when sponsored by a government, are anywhere from 50 to 75 basis points cheaper and those savings are passed along to the consumers, to people who will pay tolls. They won't have to pay as much as if the private sector were to borrow.

Furthermore, it enhances and is not at all a deterrent to the partnership between the private sector and the government made possible by way of the capital corporation.

**The Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired.

## MOTIONS

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** I move that notwithstanding standing order 96(h), the requirement for notice be waived with respect to ballot item number 52 and that Mr Harris and Mr Hodgson exchange places in the order of precedence for private members' public business.

**The Speaker (Hon David Warner):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

## PETITIONS

### VIOLENCE

**Ms Dianne Poole (Eglinton):** I have another 16 petitions signed by 186 people from Blenheim, Chatham and Cedar Springs. This is addition to the 2,949 names already submitted.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;



"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to emulate or admire, but rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

I am very pleased to add my signature in support.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It was sent to me by the Reverend Mark Koehler of the Lutheran Mission of Collingwood.

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and may include sadomasochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe all such references should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

I have signed that petition.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the costs of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislat-

ive Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Further petitions? The honourable member for St George-St David.

#### TUITION FEES

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** I appreciate the recognition.

"Whereas the NDP have hiked tuition 42% since taking office; and

"Whereas the 20% increase in tuition announced this year is the largest tuition increase in history; and

"Whereas the Premier has commented that the enormous tuition increases are simply bringing tuition levels back to the same level as they were in 1967; and

"Whereas unemployment levels for young people were at 3.6% in 1967, but today in 1994 are over 19%; and

"Whereas the NDP government has singled out young people as the only group to face record tax increases this year so far; and

"Whereas Mike Harris and the Conservatives have been silent about the unprecedented tax hike that this tuition increase amounts to; and

"Whereas Mike Harris and the Conservatives have been silent about the plight facing young people facing the worst economic circumstances since the 1930s;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to overturn the unfair 20% increase in tuition the NDP has instituted this year."

I sign my name in support.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Ted Arnott (Wellington):** I have three petitions here, all of a similar nature. Bills 45, 55 and 56 are made reference to. Of course, Bills 55 and 56 have been withdrawn; Bill 45 has not. I wish to present them at this point.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: Bills 55 and 56 have not been withdrawn. It requires a motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** That is not a point of order.

**Mr Arnott:** Mr Speaker, is it not accurate that both the members have indicated their intention to withdraw those bills?

**The Acting Speaker:** Further petitions? The honourable member for Chatham-Kent.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** It's good to see the other side fighting among themselves.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** I have a petition here signed by a number of constituents of mine. It is a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and as my colleague earlier read out, it is a petition to

Bob Rae, the Solicitor General, Dave Christopherson, and the Legislative Assembly. What they're asking is:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

On behalf of those constituents, I present their petition.

#### SEXUAL ORIENTATION

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** I have a petition to the Lieutenant Governor:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Bill 45 will change the meaning of the words 'spouse' and 'marital status' by removing the words 'of the opposite sex.' This will redefine the family as we know it.

"We believe that there will be an enormous negative impact on our society, both morally and economically, over the long term if fundamental institutions such as marriage are redefined to accommodate homosexual special-interest groups.

"We believe in freedom from discrimination, which is enjoyed by everyone by law now. But since the words 'sexual orientation' have not been defined in the Ontario Human Rights Code and may include sadomasochism, paedophilia, bestiality etc, and since sexual orientation is elevated to the same level as morally neutral characteristics of race, religion, age and sex, we believe that all such references should be removed from the code.

"Therefore, we request that the House refrain from passing Bill 45."

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition that reads as follows:

"We, the session and members of St Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Creemore, Knox Presbyterian Church, Dunedin, and St Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Maple Valley, are opposed to the changing of Bill 45 on the ground that such changes are contrary to the word of God."

I've signed that petition.

#### LAND-LEASE COMMUNITIES

**Mrs Irene Mathysen (Middlesex):** I have a petition from more than 200 seniors who live at Twin Elms in Strathroy, who petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"Whereas Bill 21 has received second reading in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 21 will provide needed protection to owners of mobile homes in mobile home trailer parks and owners of modular homes in land-lease communities; and

"Whereas many owners of mobile homes are threatened with eviction and loss of their investment in their mobile home by the action of their landlord;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"To proceed as expeditiously as possible with third reading of Bill 21."

I have signed my name to this petition.

1530

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin):** I have a large number of petitions to the Legislative Assembly, both from my constituents and from the constituents in Algoma and in Sault Ste Marie.

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the costs of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have no desire to own;

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I have signed this petition.

#### HAEMODIALYSIS

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** This petition is also addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas several patients from the town of New Tecumseth are forced to travel great distances under treacherous road conditions to receive necessary haemodialysis treatments in Orillia or Toronto;

"Whereas the government has done nothing to discourage a patchwork dialysis treatment system whereby some patients receive haemodialysis in-home and others travel long distances for treatment;

"Whereas there are currently two dialysis machines serving only two people in New Tecumseth and one patient is forced to pay for her own nurse;

"Whereas the government continues to insist they are studying the problem even though they have known about it for two years; and

"Whereas the Legislature passed Simcoe West MPP Jim Wilson's private member's resolution which called for the establishment of dialysis satellites in New Tecumseth and Collingwood;

"We demand the government establish a dialysis satellite immediately in the town of New Tecumseth."

I have signed that petition.

#### TRANSPORTATION FOR THE DISABLED

**Mr Larry O'Connor (Durham-York):** I've got a petition to the Legislative Assembly.

"Whereas the Metro Toronto council passed a bylaw, 95-93, prohibiting the cross-boundary of accessible taxis; and

"Whereas the Minister of Municipal Affairs has been requested by Mr Ronald Cowan to amend the Municipal Act to reflect open boundaries for accessible taxis



throughout Ontario; and

"Whereas the Municipal Act states that the municipality may exempt taxis from outside municipalities engaged in the transportation of the disabled;

"Now therefore and hereby be it resolved that:

"The town of Whitchurch-Stouffville requests that the rights of the disabled continue to be protected by the Ontario provincial government in the recognition of various disability programs, such as accessibility to public buildings and accessible taxi programs, and that the provincial government amend the Municipal Act to reflect the exemption of all the restrictions involving the transportation of disabled throughout the province of Ontario."

It's been circulated to all the mayors in the greater Toronto area, and we ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs to work with the Metro licensing commission and the Metro council to correct this oversight that is causing a great deal of difficulties for the constituents of the riding of Durham-York.

I affix my signature to this and hope that Metro council will react very quickly.

#### VIOLENCE

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** This is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas serial killer trading cards are being imported into and distributed throughout Ontario and the rest of Canada;

"Whereas these trading cards feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters;

"Whereas we abhor crimes of violence against persons and believe that serial killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to admire or emulate, but rather contribute to the tolerance and desensitization of violence; and

"Whereas we as a society agree that the protection of our children is paramount;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ontario government enact legislation to ensure that the sale of these serial killer trading cards is restricted to people over the age of 18 years and that substantial and appropriate penalties be imposed on retailers who sell serial killer trading cards to minors."

This is signed by several people and I'm prepared to add my name to this, as I agree with the petition.

#### FIREARMS SAFETY

**Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe West):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas we want you to know that we are strenuously objecting to your decision on the firearms acquisition certificate course and examination; and

"Whereas you should have followed the OFAH advice and grandfathered those of us who have already taken safety courses and/or hunted for years—we are not unsafe and we are not criminals; and

"Whereas we should not have to take the time or pay the cost of another course or examination and we should not have to learn about classes of firearms that we have

no desire to own;

"We, the undersigned, petition Premier Bob Rae, Solicitor General David Christopherson and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Change your plans, grandfather responsible firearms owners and hunters and only require future first-time gun purchasers to take the new federal firearms safety course or examination."

I've signed this petition and I agree with it.

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** I have a petition that's signed by 130 residents of Fauquier, and it's sent to me by Paulette Gauthier. They're petitioning the Legislature to do something about slowing down the traffic that is going through the town of Fauquier. They're concerned about the residents who are crossing back and forth across the highway, and they've asked that we do everything we can to have new signage and possibly an amber light on the highway so we can prevent accidents and encourage the people to slow down.

I'd point out that in a previous petition, I forgot to mention the number of people who had signed about the firearms acquisition. It was 225.

#### CAMPING

**Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin):** I have a petition containing a huge number of names from people in my constituency.

"We, the undersigned, petition against the Ministry of Natural Resources' recent proposal to prohibit overnight camping on crown land. Some of the areas to be affected are Moose Lake, Little Hannah Lake, Deerhound Lake, Stratton Lake, Walker Lake and West Branch. We feel this decision is taking away another one of our rights as Canadians."

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### AMMUNITION CONTROL ACT, 1994

##### LOI DE 1994 SUR

##### LA RÉGLEMENTATION DES MUNITIONS

On motion by Mr Murphy, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 149, An Act to control the Purchase and Sale of Ammunition / Projet de loi 149, Loi visant à réglementer l'achat et la vente de munitions.

**Mr Tim Murphy (St George-St David):** This bill restricts the sale of ammunition to persons holding a valid Ontario Outdoors Card with the appropriate hunting licence or a valid firearms acquisition certificate, and it is my hope that the government will support it.

##### REGISTRATION OF PEDOPHILES ACT, 1994

##### LOI DE 1994 SUR L'INSCRIPTION DES PÉDOPHILES

On motion by Mr Turnbull, the following bill was given first reading:

Bill 150, An Act to provide for the Registration of Persons who have committed Sexual Offences Against Children / Projet de loi 150, Loi prévoyant l'inscription des personnes qui ont commis des infractions d'ordre sexuel contre des enfants.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** The bill will require persons convicted of a sexual offence involving a child under the age of 14 to make a report to the police. Failure to make a report will be an offence punishable by fine or imprisonment. The bill will provide for the register of sexual offenders and be kept by the police. The public will have access to information in the register. The police will have the power to disseminate the information in the register.

On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe we have a quorum in the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** Is a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

1540

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

##### LOI DE 1993 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA TAXE DE VENTE AU DÉTAIL

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 138, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act / Projet de loi 138, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la taxe de vente au détail.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Noble Villeneuve):** When we last debated, the honourable member for Etobicoke West had the floor, and the floor is certainly his again.

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York):** Like the cathedral of the desert. Here is a symbol of it.

**Mr Chris Stockwell (Etobicoke West):** Thank you very much. The member for Fort York is truly an amazing man. He's a cathedral in the desert.

I would like to pick up my comments from yesterday. I would like to comment on a question that was asked today that probably didn't get any interest, at least in the media, and probably won't get any interest in the next year or so but may well be, financially, one of the most important decisions the government has made in this place in quite some time. I'm speaking about Highway 407. Highway 407 was the brainchild of this government. One of the most recent ideas was to create tolls on a road run by private operators to pay for road construction.

This comes back in the form of a tax bill for one simple reason. Why it does is because the whole scheme of this idea, this toll business, was that the private sector was going to underwrite the cost of constructing a road, then charge a toll to those who choose to drive on it and thereby pay off its capital commitments and make some kind of profit and in effect get a new road built in the northern portion of the GTA at no cost to the taxpayer.

There was some debate around whether it was a good idea for private people to get involved in road construction and taking it out of the hands of the government, but I think in the end there was some kind of universal acceptance that maybe this would be the route to go. There was some debate from this side of the House about

the costs and implications and so on and so forth, and at the time that debate took place, we were promised categorically in the lucid tones of the Minister of Transportation that this would not cost the taxpayers money. It was one of those truly entrepreneurial private investment programs of the new-found socialist conservative government that we elected in this province.

**Mr David Turnbull (York Mills):** Did you believe them?

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, there's a curious question that came up today. The question came from the member for York Mills, put to the Minister of Transportation. As usual, he avoided the question, vacillated, waffled, and he didn't really get an answer. But what it came down to was fundamentally this: This road was now going to be constructed through a private corporation that they set up with government guarantees—

**Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: There are only 9 NDP members, government members, in the House. I don't think we have a quorum here.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller):** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Etobicoke West may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Stockwell:** The very tactical change in financing of this development is rather interesting, because on June 24, 1993, the Premier of this province, Mr Bob Rae, made the following announcement: "Premier Rae said two Ontario-based private consortia will prepare comprehensive proposals for designing, financing and building the first phase of Highway 407, from Highway 401 in the west to Highway 48 in the east."

The only major difference between the announcement that was made on that date, June 24, 1993, and the announcement made today by the Minister of Transportation is that now the government will be guaranteeing all debt of these private construction companies, the private financiers. That's really curious, because I recall vividly not so many years ago when a similar situation happened.

A similar situation happened some number of years ago regarding the infamous white elephant close to Front Street, the SkyDome. The SkyDome really took off as far as expenditures were concerned when the government of the day, the Liberals, guaranteed the debt.

**Mr Paul Klopp (Huron):** They signed a blank cheque, though. Tell the full deal.

**Mr Stockwell:** Let me finish. They guaranteed the debt. They were full of good intentions, but the cost of SkyDome blew up, went through the roof, literally. It went through the roof and the cost expanded to some \$600 million. At the end of the day, the private companies that in fact ran SkyDome knew that the government was guaranteeing debt so they weren't concerned



about the capital costs, which in the end sunk the government position with respect to SkyDome.

I relate that story to today because it's very similar circumstances, except that rather than SkyDome we're talking about the construction of a toll road. The government, by committing to underwrite the debt of the construction of this road, has fundamentally said, "Regardless of cost—"

**Mr Klopp:** Oh, no, no, no.

**Mr Stockwell:** Oh, yes, yes, yes. When you underwrite the debt of construction and costs go up and they escalate, you will underwrite the cost of those escalations. Mark my words: The private sector corporations, the financiers, sold the deal to their people on the proviso that they do not have to pay the capital costs, that they will simply build the thing with government money and operate the operating costs associated with the tolls themselves.

That's very, very curious decision-making, very, very much related to the same kinds of ideas and philosophies and financing the previous government used when it approached building SkyDome.

I say to you that today it may not be at the top of the people's agenda, but I promise you that inside of a few years, when the economy turns around the cost of construction simply begins to rise because the economy speeds up, the cost of this road, this highway, this toll will increase. When the cost increases, by the government guaranteeing the debt, its commitment to the cost of that road will ultimately increase and cost the taxpayers money.

The argument from the other side will be that the private sector will operate this road, will collect the tolls and will service our debt. I say to those across the floor, how long, in this taxing and spending approach we've used, how long will a private sector operator operate a road that loses money on an ongoing basis, if they're serving a significant capital debt? Not long. Not long.

**Mr Kimble Sutherland (Oxford):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Could I just get clarified what piece of legislation we are dealing with here?

**The Acting Speaker:** I want to remind all members that we are dealing with Bill 138. It is an Act to Amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, and I would certainly suggest that all members who participate in this debate attempt to stay on track.

1550

**Mr Curling:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—and this is a real point of order—since the member just woke up to know it's 138, there are 13 NDP government members in the House. I don't think there's a quorum here, Mr Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Etobicoke

West can resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Stockwell:** I thank the member from the Liberal caucus. It is always important to have a quorum to do the business of this province. What I am suggesting about—

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** On a point of order, the member for Fort York.

**Mr Bisson:** No, Cochrane South. He's Fort York. I'm just wondering: Do we need to have Liberals in the House—

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Cochrane South, okay.

**Mr Bisson:** According to the standing orders of this House, is it important to have the official opposition here to listen to the wonderful debate of the honourable member from the Conservative Party?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. It's not a point of order. It's a matter of having 20 members present which constitutes a quorum; it doesn't matter where they're from. We now have a quorum and we are continuing with the debate.

**Mr Stockwell:** Bill 138 is a retail sales tax bill and there's no doubt in my mind that when this toll bridge opens they will charge retail sales tax on the toll. As people drive through the baskets, they'll throw their change in. On that will be an 8% retail sales tax. Very applicable.

The point I was driving at was, I have some real concerns any time any government, through—

**Hon Ed Philip (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** What about the GST?

**Mr Stockwell:** There may well be GST on it as well, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. But any time any government decides to start dealing with the private sector and during negotiations in those deals, any government—I don't care what party; be it the Liberals, be it the NDP, or us. Any time a government says, "I will underwrite the cost of capital; I will guarantee your loan; I will guarantee the cost of construction regardless of what that cost may be in future years," that to me is an open-ended agreement that spells one thing: trouble.

It spells trouble because then the private sector builder, the financing people, lose sight of the costs of construction because no longer is it their money; no longer is it their guarantee. It is now the government's guarantee and you know what happens when you starting spending other people's money: You're not nearly as frugal or tightfisted as if it were your own.

That's what happened on SkyDome. On SkyDome, people started spending government money and they weren't spending their own any more. That's how you had a facility go from \$150 million in 1982, when I sat on Metro council, to \$600 million upon completion.

So I don't think this is the top agenda item today, but I will say this today, and I hope to read it back into the record if I'm lucky enough to be re-elected: You're setting a very dangerous precedent here. You're setting this precedent because you're allowing people to spend

your money, and nobody spends your money better than you. If you want to capture this, rein this idea in, I would caution you as much as publicly possible: Don't let them have a free rein. Don't guarantee to pay the capital cost. Don't underwrite their financing unless you get to make the decisions on how it's built and where it's built and how much it costs, because they'll spend your money far quicker and far more than you would have spent it yourself.

The member for York Mills asked a very germane question today. It is germane because the decisions we make today are the taxes that people will have to pay tomorrow. I will tell you that if this toll road is not successful because the capital costs were too high and the private sector companies realize they're not making any money and they have no debt commitments and they have nothing holding them back, they're gone. If they're losing money on a yearly basis, they'll go. The only thing that will tie them there, through this toll bridge, provincial sales tax that you'll have to pay into the basket, I say to the member from Chatham—I'm speaking in the member from Chatham's riding tonight, as a matter of fact; I hope to speak about this—the only thing that is going to happen—

**Mr Randy R. Hope (Chatham-Kent):** Go ahead. Ask me if I care.

**Mr Stockwell:** Ask him if he cares. Do you care?

**Mr Hope:** Ask me if I care if you're speaking in my riding. I hope you get a turnout.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm trying to say this: Do you care?

**The Acting Speaker:** Please address the Chair, the honourable member.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, he asked me to ask him.

**The Acting Speaker:** Interjections are out of order.

**Mr George Mammoliti (Yorkview):** He's cutting people off.

**The Acting Speaker:** Interjections are out of order. The member for Etobicoke West has the floor.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm making a very impassioned plea, I am begging this government, to rethink this idea of financing. You know something? I don't think it was such a bad idea to have a toll road; I don't. I don't think it was a bad idea that you should in fact ask the private sector to pay for this toll road. I don't think it's a bad idea to have a toll road to pay for construction that we can't afford any more, if that's what we decide as a government. I honestly don't believe that decision-making was flawed at all. I think it was reasonable decision-making.

**Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North):** There have been toll roads for years.

**Mr Stockwell:** Yes, there have been toll roads for years. In fact, in the United States they are quite accepted and very profitable. But let me tell you the difference in the United States. In the United States, when they build a toll road the private people who own and operate that toll road pay the capital cost for that toll road. So when they build that toll road they ensure that capital costs are kept as low as possible, because they know that how

they're going to have to pay that back is through the basket that people throw their coins in when they travel the road.

So look, I'm not condemning you for the decision of toll roads. I'm not condemning you for that decision at all. In fact, I applaud you in your decision to go out and find private financiers to pay for it. I applaud you in finding private corporations to build the road. I applaud you in this joint venture to allow them to take on the responsibility of building the toll road. I applauded the minister when he made the announcement. But now the only thing I want to caution you on is that from the date of that announcement, June 24, 1993, a very important and a very conscious decision was made that changed the very fundamental principle of this toll road, and that fundamental principle is that the private sector isn't paying for it any more; the taxpayer is paying for it. That's completely different than what was announced on June 24, 1993.

I wanted to get that on the record because I didn't think it would be given the public debate that it should be given. I ask the backbenchers and caucus of the government and the cabinet ministers who go to cabinet meetings, just explore the concept of who is going to underwrite the cost. If you're going to do one thing if you're not going to change your mind about underwriting the capital cost, could you do one thing: Put a lid on it. Give them a capital expenditure of X, and once you get to X no more money comes from the government. If you could do that, that's not as good as going the private financing route, but at least it limits your liabilities. Any business person will tell you, when getting into a prospective deal, a risk business, you want to limit your liabilities.

**Mr Mammoliti:** I'd rather put a limit on you.

**Mr Stockwell:** I say to the member for Yorkview—  
1600

**Mr Mammoliti:** I'd rather put a limit on you.

**Mr Stockwell:** He's suggesting he'd rather put a limit on me. There's lots of people out there who would probably agree with you.

But I would ask that you limit your financing on this and say: "Okay, if it's \$600 million, that's it. You don't get a nickel more than \$600 million." If you could do that at least, then I think you would probably be doing the taxpayers a big, big favour. In 10 years, when this thing is built, if it costs \$1 billion rather than \$600 million, somebody's going to have to pay for that. If the tolls aren't making the payments and the private sector people decide the tolls aren't going to make the payments, they'll leave, and you'll be left with a toll road that costs a lot more than you thought that isn't paid for out of the box that you thought it would be.

Finally, when this Bill 138 was introduced—I just wanted to get one last item from my notes from yesterday. I kept my notes from yesterday. Insurance tax was the 5% car, home insurance tax that was—one thing I wanted to put on the record is that I think there should be a law passed in this province. That law would say that no government in future can in fact charge a sales tax or a GST or any form of tax on anything that is legislated that



you must own, and I say this for insurance purposes specifically.

You can't drive a car in this province without having insurance. Then I think it's not responsible government to tell people they can't drive a car in this province without insurance and then tax that insurance, because you leave them with no option. No way can they avoid that tax. They can't make a decision of buying or not buying insurance like they make a decision about buying an appliance or buying a house or any of these kinds of things. If they own a car, they must buy insurance, and if they must buy insurance, you're taxing them and they must pay a tax on a decision that they don't make.

**Mr Hope:** You make a decision on buying a car.

**Mr Stockwell:** You say they don't have to buy a car, but you know full well, coming from Chatham, and other rural areas and some areas outside, that you have no choice but to own a vehicle of some sort to get around. Otherwise you'd have cabin fever year round. You couldn't get anywhere.

**Mr Hope:** We don't live that isolated from society.

**Mr Stockwell:** I'm not saying you, but there are rural areas that do, that in fact can't get around without a car. I make that point through you, Mr Speaker. I put forward the petition on transportation, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak to this.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you very much. It is now time for questions or comments.

**Mr Bisson:** It is always actually with a lot of pleasure that I have an opportunity to listen to comments from my friend across the way from Etobicoke.

**Mr Hope:** Speak for yourself.

**Mr Bisson:** Speak for myself? No, I really do. I really find him the most entertaining of speakers in this House, and for that I applaud him.

But I have got to ask myself a question, because if I know Chris Stockwell to be one thing, it is the defender of the private sector and the defender of making sure that the private sector just goes ahead and forges ahead and makes sure it's able to make bucks in the end.

What we are doing here, I just would want to point out to our friend, is not changing the practice that has ever happened in the province of Ontario or any other province for years. For example, if you were to take a look at the northern Ontario heritage fund or the Northern Ontario Development Corp or programs offered by the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology, the same kind of process applies when we lend money to private firms in order to be able to do what they need to expand their facilities, to take advantage of new markets or to be able to build a new plant, for that matter. What we do is that we don't give them money; we say, "Go to the bank, go and borrow the money you need, and we'll guarantee a portion of that money and we'll be the guarantor."

I know one thing about the private sector, because I've had the opportunity not only in this job but in the job before to find out, that the private sector does take the responsibility quite seriously. I think you would agree—oh, he nods his head no, but I know he knows otherwise—if you take a look at the track record of those

companies that have dealt through those programs like NODC or the heritage board, you'd find their success rate is quite phenomenal. In the vast majority of those programs, I would say over 90% of the money we lend out we end up getting back. It's a good investment on the part of Ontarians in getting people back to work.

I think he needs to be somewhat fairminded when looking at that and recognizing, as I'm sure he does, that the private sector in the province of Ontario is responsible and will take the responsibility. In the unfortunate event that they were, let's say, to go into a bankruptcy situation, the company itself would drop. So there's no advantage for them to walk away from the project. It's basically, they would live and die by the project itself.

**Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South):** I'm pleased to comment on the speech by the member for Etobicoke West. I appreciate what the member said about the member for Etobicoke West, how he's entertaining, but I think the point you missed in all this is the fact that beneath all this, if you listen to the member for Etobicoke West, he understands the issue of taxation probably better than anybody else in this House. He understands it, having spent some time in municipal politics and understanding what goes on in taxation. We've been telling you for literally years in this House, going back to when he was our critic for the old Treasury, now the Ministry of Finance, that you can't continue to tax, spend and borrow like there's no tomorrow.

We've been telling you for years that we have hit the tax wall, that you can't increase any more taxes. Last year, in the budget that came in, you thought you were going to get \$2 billion by increasing the taxes. The higher taxes have done nothing except drive more people to the underground economy and kill more jobs, and until you understand that, we don't on this side of the House speak to entertain you, although I must admit he says it eloquently and I must admit I often laugh at some of his comments.

But look beyond that. What we're trying to tell you on the taxation matters is the reason we had the job losses in the province of Ontario is because it's the highest-taxed jurisdiction in Canada and one of the highest-taxed jurisdictions in all of North America. If you want to put it in a nutshell, until you cut spending and cut taxes, there will never, ever, ever be any opportunity for tax relief.

In all fairness to this government, it's been governments at all levels and of all political stripes that have been overtaxing, but you, this government, in the last budget introduced the biggest tax increases in the history of the province. I believe one of the reasons that it was defeated was because of the high tax increases, and you couldn't let well enough alone; you had to beat them. Until you understand that, there will not be job creation.

**Mr Mammoliti:** I wouldn't call the previous questioner or speaker a liar; I wouldn't do that in this place. I wouldn't say that it's just not true—

**The Acting Speaker:** You're dealing with the comments from the member for Etobicoke West.

**Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: You

cannot infer something that you cannot directly charge somebody with and I would ask that he withdraw that, because he's inferring that although he's not prepared to make the charge.

**Mr Mammoliti:** I wouldn't do that in this place.

**The Acting Speaker:** Would the honourable member please consider withdrawing? I'm asking.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Yes, I would consider withdrawing.

**The Acting Speaker:** You have withdrawn?

**Mr Mammoliti:** Yes, I have withdrawn.

We are not the highest-taxed province and I think the people in this place know that. As a matter of fact, in some cases we are lower than others. I'm not going to dwell on that; I think the people at home will know that's the case.

Directly to Mr Stockwell, the person we're supposed to ask questions to, I will ask a very direct question. If his party were to become the government of the day, I ask him this question and I ask him very directly: Would you increase taxes at any time? Because the impression I'm getting from this gentleman is that his government, if we were ever to see his government in Ontario, would never increase taxes. I want him to directly answer this question. Don't do it over a four- or five- or six-minute period, do it in 10 seconds: Yes or no, would you increase taxes?

**The Acting Speaker:** We can accommodate one final participant.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I quite enjoyed the speech of the member for Etobicoke West, because he dealt with a very important issue that I think is one that the public should know about. He related it to this bill because he knows that there will be even more tax increases of this kind if indeed there's that problem with the highway being built just north of Toronto.

I think what he pointed out most appropriately and should be emphasized is what the government is up to in hiding debt under different agencies. That's what it's all about. There was going to be a bonus with Highway 407. Everyone, I think, recognizes the need for Highway 407; that's beyond question.

The way of financing it is rather interesting, because the government came out, the Premier said, "This is a brand-new way of financing; we're going private sector-public sector cooperation," and there was going to be a considerable risk taken, as the member pointed out, by the private sector.

1610

That risk is now gone. The public sector is going to be assuming the huge risk. That debt, however, will not show up in the government books. That debt, as Wacky Bennett used to do in the Social Credit government in BC, will be placed on one of the other government agencies, in this case the real estate and—whatever term they use for that.

**Hon Mr Philip:** Sounds a lot like Bourassa. Robert Bourassa.

**Mr Bradley:** What is the name of it? The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale is going to help me with the name of

this agency. But they put it under a different designation so it doesn't show up in the books. I think it's extremely important to remember that, because we're going to watch as we move into the next few years that a lot of these decisions are going to come back to haunt, not this government or any future government, but the taxpayers of Ontario. I would prefer that they be up front, put it on the books and then try to justify it, as they may or may not before the people.

**The Acting Speaker:** This concludes questions or comments. The member for Etobicoke West has two minutes in response.

**Mr Stockwell:** Thanks to the members for St Catharines, Cochrane South, Yorkview and Oakville South.

I think the comments from the member for St Catharines were encapsulating what I was trying to say with respect to the risk and the risk factor. It was announced as a private sector risk factor, which didn't turn out that way.

The member for Oakville South talks about taxes, and I think he's right. He's grabbed the issue that I think that this party has stood on, at least in the last three or four years since I've been here.

To answer the member for Yorkview directly: No, tax increases are off the table. They are a non-starter.

**Mr Mammoliti:** Oh, right, Chris.

**Mr Stockwell:** Well, you asked me, member for Yorkview. You asked me. I'm giving you the answer. Now, you're saying, "Oh, right."

**Mr Mammoliti:** Will you raise taxes? That's the question.

**Mr Stockwell:** No. Tax increases are a non-starter. They are not on the table in this government, if it were lucky enough to be elected. It's a non-starter, and I'll say to you, I think your government has gotten the message, because your Treasurer stood in this place and stood outside this place and said: "No. No more tax increases in the next budget and the foreseeable future."

How can you charge that we're making rhetorical statements to the public because we're saying no more tax hikes, when you're doing exactly the same thing, except your history has suggested that maybe your credibility is a little less stable than maybe what we're saying, because in the past three years you've increased taxes in an incredible fashion.

To the member for Cochrane South, I want to directly respond. I say to you, in your program you lend money. I am not a huge fan of government lending money to anybody, first off. I don't care, private sector, whatever, I don't think the private sector should get government money. They sink or swim on their own, in my opinion. That's why I believe in capitalism and those ideas. I believe the private sector can either sink or swim, period. Competitive or not, you swim. Don't beg the government for money.

But let me say, on your loan structures and guarantees, the problem with this loan is that there's no cap. The costs can rise significantly, and you're not going to leave Highway 407 three quarters done. You're going to finish it, and it could cost you more money.



**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate on Bill 138?

**Mr Curling:** It's quite an opportunity for me to speak on Bill 138, and I know too that it's a important bill. I know that the government side actually would like to hear the comments which I would be making, but it's unfortunate, though, for me to make those comments. I think there is no quorum in the House, Mr Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is a quorum present?

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Scarborough North may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Curling:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. It seems to me this government has a difficult time being even government, even to be attending in the House. It's unfortunate.

**Mr Hope:** We won't look behind you, Alvin, to see who is sitting behind you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Curling:** I recall when this government, the NDP government, took over, one of the major statements it made was that it should spend its way out of this recession. There is no doubt that all parties here understand that we were going through a rather difficult time and that the recession was coming and that we must be rather careful of how we spend our money. But they thought the best way to get out of this recession was to spend. No matter how they were warned by the opposition and no matter how much they were warned by some economists, they felt if we spent our way out of this recession, it's quite possible it could have been turned around.

Lo and behold, they found themselves short of money. I don't have to remind them how many people they called in and started giving out a lot of money and felt that the money was going to come in anyhow, and today they find themselves short of those resources. What were they going to do? They decided that the only way to get money now is to tax people. It seems to me they've come into this trend. I think they must have increased taxes about 22 times since they've been in power. Their philosophy now is, if it moves, tax it, and if it doesn't move, tax it anyway. So every time that we look around—

**Hon Mr Philip:** How many times did you raise gasoline taxes?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. Interjections are out of order. The member for Scarborough North has the floor.

**Mr Curling:** I know how difficult it is for them to listen to this, because the fact is they have no strategy whatsoever in how to govern, but they feel, like the minister, or the member from Etobicoke somewhere, if he heckles me, you may not hear the facts, and he can't take the truth about it.

But what has happened now, what we have found is that we have a tax bill here now, Bill 138, to amend the retail sales tax. I couldn't believe when they said here that they're going to tax parking. It's almost ridiculous that even people who are already being highly taxed—and everywhere they turn they're being taxed by what they buy—now they're going to be taxed if they park their car; they shall be hit again with an 8% tax.

They're going to be taxed also, as I see, to brew your own. It's funny: They're going to tax these people for brewing their own booze. Where else are we going to go to tax those individuals? What has happened to taxes at this time? The fact is that every time we tax individuals, and especially hitting the poor—we are not discriminating in any way; we're going to tax right across—what this has done is reduce the disposable income of those individuals.

People today are asking themselves, "What else are they going to tax?" The few dollars they take home to support their family, it's now known that you're going to be taking more at the source by taxing them before they even get an opportunity to spend it, and even when they have an opportunity to spend it, the government is still digging into their pocket to take away some more money from them. At a time when people don't need their money to be taken away from them, this government again is coming to tax the people.

Even without this tax bill, one of the most awful, one of the most vulgar moves, I would say, that ever happened is nailing the students today, taxing their tuition more, or increasing their tuition fees by 20%. This same government, this same party, before it came into power said it would eliminate all tuition fees so that access to post-secondary education would not be charged by tuition fees.

I tell you, those students, I'm sure, who were able to vote, came to the polls in droves to say: "Yes. This is the way we'd like to see it go." Because the fact is the greatest gift that any government could give anyone is an education or some training. Here it is now that we're giving it without a tuition fee.

1620

In a short time they were increasing the fees. They were going the other way. Instead of eliminating the fees, they have increased them by 20%. One of our youngest members, who I don't think has finished paying off his OSAP loan yet, if he has one, the fact is that he can recall what an opportunity it would be for him that he wouldn't be paying an OSAP loan now because of the burden it placed on him.

But he has a job, a lovely job as a member of Parliament, and he can easily pay off his tuition fees. What has happened to those young people who can't get jobs today? They are now paying off the OSAP loans. Of course, I don't see anything wrong with paying off their loans, but they had anticipated that this government would eliminate tuition fees, and today that burden has increased.

I think it's a sellout by this government. They should hang their heads in shame to know that they promised

one thing and delivered something else. If you hit them 10% this year and 10% next year, an increase in tuition fees, they will not forget you. Their brothers who are younger than they are will remember, and their mothers and fathers and parents will not forget that you have increased their tuition fees to a point that is unbearable at a time when they themselves are losing their jobs. Here you come again increasing taxes on people who cannot afford it.

I remember too that this government spoke about that this economy is driven by small business and any way the government could help to make sure that small business could carry on their work and their businesses would be helpful. You know what they've done? They've immediately increased their taxes on small business, on insurance benefits too.

I recall too when the Liberal government did the health tax on employers, the cry of course from the Conservative Party and everyone saying that the burden had been placed on employers, making it more difficult for them to see the bottom line.

**Mr Noel Duignan (Halton North):** What the hell is that?

**Mr Curling:** That's what I'm talking about, the health tax, which was resisted by all—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. Interjections are out of order.

**Mr Curling:** This was really resisted and debated very energetically inside this House. Now they are moving to tax some insurance and they feel that the cost itself will be transferred to the employee. They're going to feel it. They're going to feel it many ways because of the expansion of business. I tell you, it's that thin wafer that will break the camel's back. They cannot continue any more.

In my constituency the bankruptcy rate is extremely high and they tell you that they cannot afford to carry on their business because of the amount of taxes that this government, all governments have levied on them.

**Mr Hope:** They're paying at a high rate, Alvin. They call it high risk.

**Mr Curling:** The member is interjecting here and saying that he banks call it high risk, because the banks have realized that each time they had to take more money out to pay more taxes, it makes them incapable to pay their loan premiums to the bank so they become a higher risk, and you continue to tax these companies more and more and more and then ask them very much to employ people.

This government stands in here every day and blames other governments. I recall that when they were in opposition and I was on the other side, in government, they said if they got their hands on government how much they would help small business, how much they would help the little man or the little woman or the little person. Today they have put more burden on these people by taxing them 22 times in under four years, and then you have the gall to talk about how we increased our taxes in this place.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. I want to remind members that it's Thursday afternoon and we still have an hour and a half to go. Interjections are out of order. The member for Scarborough North has the floor very legitimately, and you will have an opportunity to reply or question the honourable member as soon as he has completed his participation in the debate. The member for Scarborough North.

**Mr Bisson:** Tell him to sit down.

**Mr Curling:** Mr Speaker, I know they want me to sit down. Some of them are sleeping, some are not here. Do we have a quorum here, Mr Speaker?

**The Acting Speaker:** Is a quorum present?

**Acting Clerk Assistant (Ms Lisa Freedman):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Acting Clerk Assistant:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Scarborough North may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Curling:** Ever since this debate on Bill 138 started, for the last three days in this House the words have been, "Is there a quorum here?" This government should understand that it should keep a quorum here to get the business conducted. They have enough members to do so.

I was about to tell you about the warranty tax, which I tried to understand. The parliamentary assistant is here, and maybe at some time he'll explain to us how this warranty tax is going to work and how this will not be a burden on that individual who is struggling through to pay his basic living expenses. If you feel it's the companies that are going to take on this warranty tax—not at all. It's the individual who comes in and finds that the job was not done properly in the first place on the goods under warranty, and now faces the fact that he has been taxed again for something that should have been done before.

I can't believe a government could look now to start taxing warranties. As I said, it seems to me that if something moves, tax it, and if it doesn't, tax it anyhow. The fact is that people with warranties are living in fear that, my golly, if something should ever happen to a car, for instance, an extra cost is going to be levied on them again.

1630

I was trying to understand that, how you could ever tax warranties, but you find a way to do this. My overall appeal to this government is that now is not the time to increase taxes; it's not the time at all to do so. People are trying their best to meet the day-to-day expenses and find again that another Treasurer has put his hand in their pocket and taken out the money want to feed their family with. You may think that another \$5 here or another \$3 there is not enough to break a family. I'm telling you, the families who are coming into my constituency or the individuals coming into my constituency office on Fridays are saying to me that they're just about giving up.



An individual came into my office the other day and told me he was going to declare bankruptcy. Whatever the cost of bankruptcy was at the time, he was unable to find that money. He couldn't find that money to pay the bankruptcy fee, it was so bad. The bankruptcy counsellor, or whatever they call them, decided it was okay and waived half of it, and told him to come in and talk. He didn't even have that amount of money. That's how bad it is out there. They need every penny.

New taxes at this time is the wrong direction to go. One person defined it this way to us on the task force on jobs I was on. He said: "In this province it's like three treasurers picking your pocket at the same time. When it's not the provincial government dipping its hand into the pockets of our citizens, it is the federal government or the municipal government." Lo and behold, they just give up. No wonder the welfare line is longer, because there are no jobs out there and there is more bankruptcy out there. I'm saying to you that it is the wrong time for us to increase taxes on these people.

You would think that this government, which felt it was the disciples of the poor and the downtrodden, to protect all those without jobs, to protect those without funds to maintain their families, would be the party that looked after their welfare. But oh, no. They are the first ones to quickly jump on and abuse the whole system of welfare for those people. As a matter of fact, when my leader spoke about some of the discrepancies and the bad management of welfare, the Minister of Community and Social Services over there, Mr Silipo, said, "There's nothing wrong with the welfare system; it's fine," and that there did not need to be any kind of changes within the system. Then all of a sudden, a couple of weeks afterwards, he had welfare cops looking into that system.

I thought these NDP members here would talk about protecting some of those welfare recipients, but no. What they did was they went around cutting welfare indiscriminately. The poor people feel rather vulnerable, that they had no representatives looking after their cause.

I for one would say that yes, there is abuse in the system. I don't think the abuse is as widespread as some would say. Like any other system, we've got to clean up where there's abuse, like workers' compensation or unemployment insurance. But I hear nothing from those over on that side to say they would protect those who are legitimately on welfare. It is almost like, "Let's find a victim and blame it all on the people who are on welfare."

**Mr Sutherland:** A little like Lyn did with the Somali community.

**Mr Curling:** I think he's speaking of our leader, Lyn McLeod, and the Somali situation. The leader of my party pointed out to you that maybe we should start looking at a system that has not been run properly, and talked about a report that is sitting out there, which I'm sure they were about to implement; I think it was from the federal government. We weren't quite sure whether they were going to implement it. But all of a sudden that side, the government side, started to talk about the fact that the leader had made these remarks and comments about the Somalis, which she did not.

**Mr Mammoliti:** What did she do? Oh, come on.

**Mr Curling:** What she did is that she brought to the attention of the government that there was a report out there that stated that Somalis are abusing the system, and she asked, when will the government be looking into these instances?

**Mr Bisson:** She charged that something had happened, a shot from the hip.

**Mr Curling:** It wasn't her report. She was going to ask, "Where is that report?" The fact is that they, immediately accusing my leader—

**Mr Mammoliti:** She isolated them. What are you talking about?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The member for Scarborough North has the floor.

**Mr Curling:** The problem is that the members over there can't take the truth. They would like to play politics with all of this, to say that—

**Mr Bisson:** Oh, my God, listen to this guy.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Curling:** If you stop playing politics with it, you may be able to resolve the problem. But you sit there on your high horse, in your seats, and feel that we're going to blame the leader of the Liberal Party for this report.

**Mr Anthony Perruzza (Downsview):** Who is the leader of the Liberal Party?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Scarborough North has the floor, very legitimately.

**Mr Mammoliti:** He's not answering the question.

**The Acting Speaker:** This is not question period. We will have the opportunity to ask questions or making comments as soon as the honourable member completes his participation in the debate. In the interim, the member for Scarborough North has the floor, very legitimately.

**Mr Curling:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The member over there was talking about hot air, and Now I start feeling it coming over to this side. I presume he has gathered back his air and is pumping it across here.

Is there a quorum in the House, Mr Speaker? This government can't even keep a quorum in the House.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is there a quorum present?

**Acting Clerk Assistant:** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Acting Clerk Assistant:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Scarborough North may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Curling:** I take my job rather seriously. The people of Scarborough North, who have sent me here on three different occasions, have sent me here to represent the issues and causes they believe in. Members who believe they have more importance here than anybody else will start checking themselves. I respect everyone in this House, that their views must be listened to and heard.

I believe also that there are people in our community, across this province, who are today out of jobs. Their

businesses are folding up. There are business people who'd like to invest in this country and in this province and are being dissuaded, because the way this province is being governed, they decide to go elsewhere.

1640

I think when this government can take its responsibility seriously in how it taxes its people and how the pain and suffering are being levelled on the people today, it could understand that, and that members here ridicule others in here, the disrespect that you have for me—and that's fine—is the same disrespect you have for the people I represent and many of us represent.

It may not be easy for you to listen to all of this, and I understand that and that's why you're not here. It may not be easy for you to be told that people are losing their jobs and people are losing their homes and that you're taking away money from them that they need to feed themselves. It's not easy to listen to that. I also believe it's not easy to find a solution to all these kinds of problems, but the fact is that if we are objective in what we're hearing, what we can do then is to take those ideas, as tough as they are, and make sure that we can have policies to have people have some respectability in just living itself.

Today, in these couple of weeks, we're seeing a lot of crimes that are being committed in our country, in our province, and we see that people are trying to find blame with individuals, and, "Who are the ones who are causing this?" I caution all the members here that while all are concerned about the crime wave that has been happening, some people will blame it on the economy and that may be some cause; some people may blame it on the loss of jobs and that may be the cause; and some people may blame it on the government approach to how it taxes, and that may be the cause.

So it's difficult to listen to. It's difficult to see that the unemployment rate increases because there are no jobs to go to, and it's easy, of course, to blame the previous government for not putting things in place properly, or blame it on other governments of other levels so that we would have a better economy around here. But we may look at ourselves, at the policies we put in place, how we have people participate in the system.

One member over there from Etobicoke has stated that I am anti-employment equity.

**Hon Mr Philip:** You voted against it.

**Mr Curling:** The fact is that we want a province which can participate in everything. We don't want people cutting deals with unions and cutting deals with business. We want to be fair. We don't want an equity bill that excludes white males and includes others; we want a bill that's fair, to include all human beings if they are qualified, because when we do that—we set people against each other. When the member for Etobicoke said, "You voted against it," the fact is that he himself doesn't even understand what equity is all about, what fairness is all about—

**Hon Mr Philip:** You didn't have the guts to get up and vote against your own party members.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Curling:** —and that's how we tax too. The member—will we have this yapping from the member?

**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member who is interjecting knows very well that interjections are not in order. He's not in his seat.

**Mr Curling:** Levelling taxes must be fair, and allowing people access to work must be fair. It must not be dressed up in all kinds of clothes and coats.

The fact is that only some may come in, and I am proud to know I voted against that employment equity thing you have there. It's not on employment equity; it's a restrictive bill. We want a province that is fair to all. We want policies, we want taxes that are fair that do not discriminate in any way, and as long as you start bringing in discriminatory laws, you will have friction within the province. We'll continue to have friction.

No one is asking you, "Don't allow them to participate in paying their way in bringing this economy back to where it could be." Everyone would like to do that, to pay their portion, but no one wants to be punished more than the other. No one wants to be told to go to the back of the line because they are white males. They want to go to the back of the line if they are not qualified, if people are not qualified within this—

**Hon Mr Philip:** The bill doesn't do that. Why are you misleading the public on this?

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member, I beg—he is not in his seat and I heard some unparliamentary comments. Please. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, please withdraw those comments.

**Hon Mr Philip:** I withdraw the comments. I feel that he was certainly not giving the right facts.

**Mr Curling:** Mr Speaker, I don't know how sincere the member is. He's not even in his right seat when he's withdrawing that.

**The Acting Speaker:** Will the honourable member please take his own seat and withdraw those remarks from his own seat.

**Hon Mr Philip:** I withdraw the remarks from my own seat.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. The member for Scarborough North.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Scarborough North has the floor.

**Mr Curling:** The most misleading situation here is that we must make sure that all people can participate fairly in this system and that people are not penalized for one reason or the other because of the colour of their skin or because of their height or their size. We should remove barriers so that all can participate fairly, and when they understand that, when we all understand it, regardless of what party we are, then we can talk about equity, fairness, fair access. Governments are here to make policies that are fair, and if there are things that impede that kind of access, then that's when we have a government that is—justice could be, as we said, blind.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions or comments.

**Mr Carr:** I'd like to comment on the remarks made



by the member for Scarborough North, and I appreciate some of the remarks he made. I think at one point he hit the whole gist of the argument that we are making on this bill. The taxes are so high in the province of Ontario and when this government was elected, it was going to tax the rich. The rich people were going to pay, we could have all these social programs in the world and they were going to tax the rich.

As the member for Scarborough North pointed out, this bill hits the average working man and woman in the province of Ontario. This is a tax on the average citizen; the poor and the average citizens are the ones who pay the bulk of the tax. That's what this bill does. It puts a tax on beer; beer, of all things. We're not talking about expensive wine or Chivas Regal or whatever.

The taxes on beer that you buy at the Beer Store now are so high that the average working person can't go out there and afford a case of beer in the province of Ontario to watch the hockey games because it's so expensive, so on their own behalf they go out and decide to make some beer. They'll take the time, the two, three hours it takes, to avoid the taxation because the taxes are already too high. And what does this government do? They are so strapped for cash, they've got to go out and tax the you-brews and tax beer for the average working person in the province of Ontario. That's what we've stooped to.

They were elected, they were going to tax the rich, the big corporations, they were going to pay for all the programs, and now the average working men and women, the ones who come back from the Ford Motor plant in my riding and want to have a beer, are now going to be taxed on the beer that they make on their own time. That's what this bill comes down to. You're now taxing the average people. You're taxing the average worker, the average person. It's wrong and we're going to fight you every inch of the way on any tax increases.

**Mr Hope:** Boy, life is tough when you can't buy a case of beer and watch a hockey game.

I must start off by saying it was good to see here that we have one member from the Conservatives and one member from the Liberals and it seems like nobody wants to listen to their comments. But I was interested in listening to you where the comments were made about the tax on working people and tax on small businesses.

Back when the Liberals were in government, let's talk about the attacks on working people. The 8% sales tax went across right on everybody. It didn't matter what your income was. He talked about the Ford Motor worker. Let's talk about the woman who worked in the small factory down there making seven bucks an hour, how the 8% sales tax affected her—in good economic times, I must remind the member.

You want to talk about another attack on working people? How about Bill 162 that you brought forward as the Liberal government? Let's talk about the Ontario motorist protection plan which you brought forward and attacked on the working people. Let's talk about market value reassessment you levied on all the rural communities and you put forward on us. You want to talk about attacks on working people? They're paying for those attacks that you put on them today.

1650

Let's talk about the 8% sales tax that you levied on them too, where they lost clients because working people couldn't afford to pay for stuff.

Let's talk about the employer's health tax the Liberals put forward.

Let's talk about no training funds put forward for those employers to make the changes. Your government supported free trade and never helped the corporations make the structural change.

Let me tell you what this government's trying to do with small business and those working people. It's called Jobs Ontario, which is a major program that has a lot of good success.

I see Mr Bradley laughing. Well, let me tell you, Andre Lamoue, Pontiac-Buick dealer in Tilbury, is not laughing. Let's talk about Coca-Cola Bottling in Chatham. It's not laughing. Let's talk about Elan Corp in Chatham. It's not laughing. Let's talk about Navistar in Chatham, which is one of our major truck manufacturers. It's not laughing.

So when the member stands up and gives this self-righteous speech, he better have his facts put forward.

**Mr Bradley:** I want to commend the member for Scarborough North for—

**Mr Bisson:** Jim, you said you weren't going to get up.

**Mr Bradley:** Oh, I was not supposed to get up; I just realized that. But now that I'm up, I guess I'll have to comment on my colleague's speech.

I thought it was an excellent speech. I listened with a good deal of interest to it, as I always do, and I know it's provoked the members of the government to make certain statements. But I think what the member has put forward is something that's related to 1994 and the circumstances we face in 1994 and the fact that there's another tax—it's coming back a little later now—that has been levied. He's expressing concern that at a time when you're into a recession and you need as much money in circulation as possible with individuals and with groups within our society, it is unwise at that time for a government to extract more funds.

You find, generally speaking, that in good economic times people still don't like taxes, but they're prepared to sustain those taxes when they're making a lot of money, when the economy is booming, much more so, and they're much less damaging, than when you are in a difficult situation where you want to put money back in the hands of consumers. And I know he noted that my good friends in the New Democratic Party, when they sat on this side of the House, justifiably in their own platform and in their own philosophy, demanded many, many services of government and the expansion of those services. I think they recognized at the time when they asked for those services that implied would be some tax increases.

Well, today we're seeing a decline in services. Because of economic circumstances, the government has made that decision to reduce its expenditures, and as a result, the government shouldn't have to increase the taxes at this

time. So I think that was the point he was making in a very moderate and sensible fashion, and I want to commend my colleague the member for Scarborough North.

**The Acting Speaker:** We can accommodate a final participant.

**Hon Mike Farnan (Minister without Portfolio in Education and Training):** I'm very perturbed by the direction of the debate. I find that members are not dealing with reality. When I talk to my constituents in Cambridge, very clearly we ask them: "What is the sense of the general direction?" The people of Ontario recognize that the plan that we are working with as a government to maintain services, to maintain jobs, to keep a balance in society between fiscal responsibility in terms of keeping our eye on the budget and having the deficit go on a downward course this year and next year is the kind of realistic, sensible, logical approach that the people of Ontario want.

They look back at the 1985 situation. In the previous administration—and this hasn't been mentioned by the speakers. They say, "In good times, we should be taxing." We say, "In good times, you should be going consciously after your deficit and eliminating it and having money in the bank."

Unfortunately, what we inherited from the Liberals went in the opposite direction. Good times—they didn't think of what we had to face. But the people of Ontario are fair and the people of Ontario are looking at our government. They see we have a plan. They see we're sticking to the plan. They know that the deficit is on a downward course.

They know that we are maintaining jobs, they know that we are maintaining services, and this is precisely the sensitive approach that the people of Ontario want. They don't want the Klein approach of Alberta. They don't want the Liberal approach of more taxes. They want more and more services, but how are they going to pay for it?

**The Acting Speaker:** This completes the time allotment for questions and comments. The member for Scarborough North has two minutes in response.

**Mr Curling:** It seems to me I rattled the cages over there. The member for Chatham-Kent didn't want to deal with the—he never said "Bill 138" once, or "the retail tax credit bill." He talked about the fact of our time in government. We were talking about a present taxing of this government now. The fact is that they say, "I don't want to deal with this." We have the largest deficit ever in any government. "We don't want to deal with that."

If you want to talk about facts, my dear friend from Cambridge—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr Curling:** My dear colleague from Cambridge stated that when he speaks to his people in Cambridge, it's what they say. Ask them what kind of government they have now and the government they thought they had in 1990.

**Interjection:** They told you.

**Mr Curling:** They told us what kind of government

they wanted in 1990 and they're telling you right now the kind of government they want now: to take your hands out of their pocket and to make sure the economy gets back working again. They want to tell the member from Chatham to deal with reality, deal with today, deal with the fact that people are hurting. They're saying to you today—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Curling:** It's difficult, I know, Mr Speaker, to talk over the noise over there.

**Mr Hope:** I'd deal with your legislation today—

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Chatham-Kent has had his opportunity. The member for Scarborough North has the floor.

**Mr Curling:** If you are all reasonable people, if you are the type of people you said you were in 1990, you will start listening to the poorer people or those ordinary people out there who are hurting, and you should look very seriously at this present bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate on Bill 138?

**Mr Carr:** I'm pleased to enter the debate, on behalf of the people of Oakville South and the Burlington portion of my riding, on Bill 138.

I sit on the finance and economics committee, and this bill, as we may have heard through some of the discussions, is a result of last year's budget. It's interesting we're coming up on this year's budget some time in April or early May. This is a result of last year's budget.

I was going back on part of the report we did last year on the pre-budget finance committee where we talked about what the government should do prior to the bill being introduced that we're debating here today.

When we heard from the people across this province—and the process, I'll just outline it very quickly, during the finance committee, the pre-budget, is that you hear from the people of the province. People come in and tell you on taxation issues and housing issues and social issues what they would like to see.

During that period there was a chap who came in, and I want to quote what he said. Then I'll tell you exactly what happened with Bill 138, which was part of the largest tax increase ever brought in by a provincial government, during some of the worst economic times.

There was a chap who came in and he said, "Never in the past half century"—

**The Acting Speaker:** Order, please. On a point of order, the honourable member for Brampton South.

**Mr Robert V. Callahan (Brampton South):** Mr Speaker, we're discussing the question of taxation, which is important to all the people of this province. You would think the government would be able to keep at least 20 members in here to maintain the quorum of the House.

**The Acting Speaker:** Is a quorum present?

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex McFedries):** A quorum is not present, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals:** A quorum is now present, Speaker.



**The Acting Speaker:** The honourable member for Oakville South may resume his participation in the debate.

**Mr Carr:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I will try to not antagonize the members opposite. I know it's Thursday and tempers are sometimes a little frayed at the end of the week, but I will continue on.

It wasn't me who said this, but there was a chap who came through who said this, and I think it's very important for some of the members to hear what was said prior to Bill 138 coming in. They came in and talked about what they felt should be done with regard to taxation.

1700

The quote he gave is: "Never in the past half century have business conditions in Ontario been as bad. We've had a record number of bankruptcies, chilling numbers of plant closures and layoffs. See our blood. No more taxes. Tax increases will only make the deficit position worse and subsequently put even more pressure on our social programs."

I'll repeat, that was prior to the pre-budget hearings, not this winter, this January, but the previous January, prior to the implementation of Bill 138. To put it in a nutshell, what he said is that if you increase taxes any more, you're going to actually get less revenue and put more pressure on our social programs. The government didn't listen. They didn't listen to our pre-budget report, which is what I quoted from, where we listened to the people of the province and said: "Here's what they are saying. We agree with them. Would you please do it."

They didn't listen, and now what has happened as a result of bills like Bill 138? Exactly what that chap said would happen happened. You now have less revenue. Last year's budget, including Bill 138, increased taxes to the tune of \$2 billion. What happened to revenue? It actually went down. You increased the rates, you increased taxation on insurance premiums, on the brew-your-own beer people, and the revenue you got went down.

It's not very complicated. You don't need to be a graduate. It's very simple: We have now hit a point where any increases in taxes get you less revenue, plain and simple. Economic theories are very simple. People will do anything to avoid paying taxes, and I will get into a little bit of the underground economy, which has been spurred by high taxation levels.

My friends opposite were talking about different governments in different jurisdictions. In all fairness, the problem with taxation is the cumulative effect. The people of this province aren't concerned whether it's the municipal politicians' fault or whether it's the federal government's fault or whether it's the provincial government's fault; they're saying that the taxation is too high.

It's interesting that in one of the federal budgets when they lowered the taxes this provincial government jumped in and increased it the same amount that the federal government had reduced it. All people in this province are concerned about is the bottom line. They're sick and tired of the finger-pointing, saying: "It's your fault, it's your fault. It's the federal government, the municipal, the

provincial." Quite frankly, governments at all levels have created the problems.

But what you've got to realize is that bills like Bill 138, with the taxation levels that you have put together, are killing the jobs in the province of Ontario. The economists that came before that committee two years ago said that the recovery was slow, that domestic consumer demand would remain relatively weak, that the unemployment rate would remain stubbornly high and that now was not the time to increase taxes, because consumer confidence was very fragile.

It wasn't complicated. It was very simple. They said you cannot increase taxes, like you've done in Bill 138, because if you do you're going to threaten the recovery. That's what happened. What do you think happens to the average person, the average consumer, who now has his beer taxed, his insurance premiums taxed? Do you think he's going to go out and spend money on a new fridge, a new stove, on any new clothes, anything that he needs in terms of discretionary spending when the taxation level in the province of Ontario is such that we have to stoop to taxing insurance premiums and beer?

The reason that the taxation has gone on the beer and the insurance premiums is because it's something that can't be hidden. In everything else in the province of Ontario they're going underground. That's why we had the major problem with cigarettes. You could have increased it as much as you want. They were bringing it across the border, smuggling, which gave rise to all the problems that we had down in the Cornwall area. You've got to realize that any tax increases will get you less revenue.

I'll get into some of the details on Bill 138, because there's a broad overview. I want to tell you, the people who came before that finance committee said it again. I'll use a quote, not from me, because I know some of the members opposite think we always attempt to be partisan in our rhetoric.

One of the people who came forward said, "The problem with the deficit-debt-interest black hole is the fact that the provincial government has not just reached, but has effectively passed, the limits of taxation, the limits where further tax increases and new taxes result in less revenue, not more revenue." That's what was predicted two years ago in the prebudget finance committee. They said, "You're going to get no more revenue if you increase taxes." What does Bill 138 do? Bill 138 attempts to increase insurance premiums; taxes the brew-your-own-beer houses. That's where we have gone in the province of Ontario.

I want to be a little specific and talk about the tax on insurance. Ontario residents or businesses purchasing new insurance policies after last year's budget or renewing existing premiums are liable to pay the 8% tax on premiums. On top of everything else, in this day and age, when it's difficult to make ends meet, this NDP government is now taxing insurance premiums in the province. I defy any member on the other side to say that he or she got elected by promising taxes on insurance premiums.

If you talk to some of the people who supported you in the last election, if they knew you were going to stoop

to putting a tax on insurance premiums I suspect a lot of them would not have voted for you. I'm not going to get into why people make promises and get in. I'm sure a lot of you thought the money was going to fall out of the sky.

But we told you prior to the 1990 campaign that the taxation levels were too high in the province and that there couldn't be any more increases. That's why you stooped to putting it on insurance premiums, because it can't be hidden. That's something that's out in the open and you can't go underground. The people of this province don't believe governments are spending their money properly and believe it is being wasted on a lot of programs—to be non-partisan, they think that about municipal governments and the federal government as well the provincial government—and they will do anything to avoid paying taxes. That's why the bureaucrats in the Ministry of Finance are attempting to tax insurance premiums: They're trying to find something that can't be hidden.

We have now reached that point where the men and women, the hardworking people of this province who go out every day, will do anything to avoid taxation, because they believe that right now the taxation levels are too high and that governments are spending it incorrectly. What did the bureaucrats in the Ministry of Finance in this last budget do? They taxed insurance premiums.

Non-residents of Ontario purchasing new policies or renewing policies that cover individuals residing in Ontario are liable also to pay the 8% tax. Ontario residents or business holders of group insurance are liable to pay an 8% tax on premiums.

Here we have a party that has fought for many years for benefits for workers, in some of its members past experience, involved in collective bargaining process with unions and so on, trying to get more money for the hardworking men and women of this province. For that I give a lot of you credit; I know some of the members are here. But as a government, what are you now doing? You are now taxing benefits.

It's not good enough to tax based on income, which is what you said you would do, and tax the corporations and that the rich people would pay. If you had a higher income, your personal tax rate would be paid and it would be on the rich people, and the corporations would pay. That's what you said in the last election campaign. You said you'd increase taxes, not on the benefits of the working people in the province of Ontario.

That's what you're doing. That's what Bill 138 is hitting. It is hitting the hardworking average citizen who just wants to go out there and work hard, make a buck. You're taxing their insurance premiums and their beer. That's what this bill is all about, for those members who may not have read it. If you don't agree that you would not have been elected if you'd said to the hardworking men and women of this province, "We're going to tax your insurance premiums, we're going to tax your beer," well, you're wrong. You would not have been elected had you said that prior to 1990.

Group benefits are going to be taxed now in the province. They put in some exemptions in terms of

insurance policies. I don't know who decided that. I guess the bureaucrats went through a list and said: "In. Out. In. Out." The bottom line is that they're attempting to get more money out of the benefits of insurance premiums in the province of Ontario. Ontario residents provided benefit plans are liable to an 8% tax payable by the plan-holder. That's what this bill is all about.

1710

I wish the members opposite would sometimes have a little bit more political courage to stand up to the Minister of Finance and the Premier when some of these measures come in. If you don't want to do it publicly—I think there are some members who disagree with this bill on taxing beer and insurance premiums and that some of you—and we'll never know unless we're a fly on the wall—may have voiced your concern to the government. I think what happens, quite frankly, is that they don't find out about it until after the budget and it's too late, and they say nothing and we're merrily on our way.

But if you don't say anything to the Minister of Finance or the Premier about these taxes, even if it's after the fact, even if you don't change Bill 138—because it's too late, as it's been introduced—maybe you'll have an impact on some of the other things the Ministry of Finance is now looking at taxing or, as it's looking at doing now, increasing fees. Had you had the political courage to stand up to the Minister of Finance and the Premier during this period when Bill 138 was pushed through, I believe we may not have seen some of the tax increases that have been brought about over the last little while—non-revenue taxation, as they call them, increases in fees.

A lot of you sit there, and I appreciate that you may not want to publicly come out against your Premier. Quite frankly, in the last election most of you wouldn't have been elected had you not had the party symbol in front of your name; most people didn't even know who you were. But when you don't stand up for the hardworking men and women you represent on bills like 138, you are not doing your job, because that's what they sent you here for.

On some of the other issues out there, the welfare issues and the education issues, I suspect we can disagree on how to handle them, but the people who sent you here did not believe you were going to tax insurance premiums and beer. That's why they're angry at you. And they're more angry at you because a lot of you did not have the political courage to stand up to the Minister of Finance and the Premier when they did this. I think the Minister of Finance sits back—the bureaucrats, in a lot of cases, are pushing this through—and says, "Get me more revenue," and they say: "Okay, here's how we do it. We can't allow people to go underground in the economy, so here's how we'll do it. Here's how we'll do it so the people can't get around paying this tax."

That's what you've done. You've taxed insurance policies and beer. I say you should be ashamed of yourself. Even if we can't change Bill 138, you should have had the political courage to tell the Minister of Finance that it's wrong so it won't happen in the next budget.



There has been tax added on the statutory insurance schemes. This bill will bring taxes on parking charges. That's how low we have stooped in terms of trying to get revenue: We are now taxing parking charges. A lot of the members opposite, if there had been any increase in any fees charged by parking lot attendants, would have been the first ones to jump up and down and accuse them of gouging and ripping off the people who are trying to park their cars. What does this government do? They are now taxing parking charges. Another reason they did this is because they know it can't be hidden. They know it's out in the open and you can't get around paying it, like you can with some of the other taxes. You can't smuggle, like you can with cigarettes and liquor. So they are now taxing parking charges.

Before I go on to some of the other things, I want to basically tell you the problem this government has. The problem this government has is that it believes it has a revenue problem. They believe there is not enough revenue in the province of Ontario. The fundamental difference between them and our party is that we do not believe we have a revenue problem in the province of Ontario. We have a spending problem in the province of Ontario. In some respects they've done a better job than a lot of governments over the last 10 years; they've been forced to, based on the revenue dropping. Until you realize that it is not a revenue problem, that it is a spending problem, and until you tackle the issues of spending, you will never, never, never get the deficit down and allow the taxation levels to be reduced.

It's not an easy task. What needs to happen right now is spending still needs to be reduced. We're still at least \$10 billion in debt each and every year; that's "billion" with a "b." Each and every year we go further and further into debt, and even with the tough choices you've had to make—in your minds they've been tough choices. They're not easy for any political party or any member to make, but in your own mind they've been a lot tougher than you probably thought you were going to do when you came in in 1990. But there still need to be major decreases in spending in the province of Ontario.

Now again, a lot of the problems weren't your fault. During the 1980s we spent double, triple the rate of inflation, we ran up the spending to unconscionable levels and it was just simply unsustainable when the recession hit. That's why the fundamental principle has to be, if you want to put it in a nutshell: What needs to happen in the province of Ontario is that we need to cut spending; we need to cut taxes. That's what will create the jobs, because higher increases, like Bill 138, in taxes are only going to mean fewer jobs to the people in the retail sector, for example, because the consumers out there are fearful for their own jobs and they're not going to be spending as long as you bring taxes in on insurance premiums, on parking lot charges, on beer. They're fearful of every budget brought in by you people because you've done nothing but increase taxes. You've killed consumer confidence. That's what killing jobs.

I believe there are some long-term things that need to be done, but until you realize that you need to cut spending and allow some of these taxes to come down,

you will never create the jobs necessary. That's why, when you came to power, the unemployment rate was about 6%. It's probably double or remains close to 11.3%, give or take whatever it is. In the province of Ontario, when you came in power, we had the fourth-best unemployment rate in all of Canada. It's now the worst: 80% of the jobs that were lost in this recession were lost in Ontario because of the high taxation level. The high taxes have driven businesses out, killed consumers' confidence, killed investment and that's why the consumers aren't spending.

When the people came in and voted for this government they thought, in spite of the ideologies of the socialists, the one thing they would do was protect the average worker. In 1990 that's what they thought, that the one thing they would do—most people aren't socialists in the province of Ontario, but they thought the NDP would at least protect the average worker.

What you're doing with Bill 138 is taxing the average worker's insurance premium, it's beer, it's parking lot charges. The average worker is whom this bill is hitting; the average worker, not the big corporations like you said you would. You were going to tax the Conrad Blacks and your minimum corporate tax was going to pay for all these programs. What happened to that? Why do you stoop to taxing the hardworking men and women and the average worker in the province of Ontario? Why?

One of the reasons is, and most of you probably didn't know this, but I think the Premier and the Minister of Finance knew it: The bulk of our revenue comes from the people in the middle class. The rich people, a lot of them can move their money to offshore jurisdictions. You can move your bank account to Switzerland or Sweden or Germany tomorrow and no one will know. You don't even need to go to the bank any more. The rich people can move their money into tax shelters and move it all over the world. The people who can't are the hardworking men and women you've hit with your Bill 138.

The bulk of our revenue, for those who don't know, comes from the retail sales tax and the personal income tax. Only about 7% of our revenue comes from corporations. I believe the Minister of Finance knew that in the last election when he said, "We can have all the social programs in the world and we're going to tax the corporations." Somebody who had been around 20 years, like the Minister of Finance, knew that only 7% of our revenue came from corporations. You could increase it 200% and you wouldn't get very much more revenue; in fact, less, because more companies would leave. But you know what? He said it anyway. He said, "We'll do it anyway."

I don't suspect a lot of these members knew, particularly the new ones, where the revenue came from and that you couldn't tax corporations. But the Premier knew and the Minister of Finance knew you couldn't tax corporations, but they said it anyway. Of course the reason they said it was that they never thought they'd be elected. That's why the people are so cynical and mad at you, because the Premier and the Minister of Finance knew. The promises you were making about taxing corporations and taxing the rich, the number of people and the amount

of revenue that could be taken out of there is very small.

That's why, when the personal income tax was put on, the massive surtax that was put on for the middle class, the average worker got hit with it. The average worker making a little over \$53,000 got the massive surtax.

1720

When this government was in opposition, it was going to tax the rich. There was going to be a surtax on everybody making money. The average worker at \$50,000 didn't think they were going to be ones who were going to get hit with the massive surtax that you brought in over the last few years. That's why, over the last little while, there was so much anger from the working people of this province towards this government, because the tax increases were towards the middle class and the average working people, unlike what you said you would do in opposition, which was to tax the rich.

On the finance committee, I put together some recommendations—sometimes I wonder why I even do them; I suspect most people don't even read them in this House—practical solutions of what we want to put together. Mr Speaker, I want to tell you, what the men and women who came before the committee two years ago in the winter were saying was right. Had you listened to them, your revenue wouldn't be dropping and you wouldn't have had to tax insurance premiums.

This year we did the same thing. We put together our pre-budget report. It was tabled I guess around the end of January. I suspect again the members don't even read it, don't even look at what's been put forward by the people of this province. If any members do want to look at it, the same things were said: The tax levels are too high, you can't increase taxes any more, and if you do, you're going to get less revenue. You have to look at spending, not tax increases, if we're ever, ever going to deal with the problems in this province.

We're not content to do a couple of finance reports. We put together, as part of the underground economy report, some of our suggestions again, because that's all the underground economy is: The biggest tax revolt in this history has been the underground economy. The average person here who's willing to pay their taxes says: "We're not going to do it any more. I will do anything to avoid paying taxes." That's why we have the underground economy that, folks, could be taking up to 20% of our gross domestic product; 20%, some economists are saying, has now gone underground because of the high taxation levels.

We put together some solutions at the end of our minority report, because unfortunately the members of the finance committee couldn't come to an agreement, so we had to put together a minority report. But I put together, as part of my function on the finance committee, along with my colleague from Markham, nine commonsense solutions of what to do about the underground economy, nine little points that we put together in conjunction that the members opposite, I guess discouragingly, probably don't even read. Sometimes you try to be practical and put some solutions forward, and you wonder whether it's worth it.

But we will continue to do that. As long as people come before the finance committee and the underground economy committee and are willing to give their solutions to me, I'm going to attempt to put them forward in these reports, which are now piling up in my office, and some of the suggestions we want to put forward. If nobody reads them, I will attempt to put them forward in the reports. I'll attempt to articulate them as best I can in the speeches in the House for the members who are now at least having to sit to listen to me. But I would encourage you to get into some of the detail. Look at the solutions.

In the finance committee we had about 15 points that we felt would be helpful to the government. In the underground economy, we put together about nine points that we thought would be helpful. And had you listened to some of those suggestions that came before the finance and economics committee, you would not be sitting here today debating taxes on insurance premiums and brew-your-own beer.

We have a deficit crisis. You don't need to turn around—as a matter of fact, today's newspaper had "Booze Taxes Imperil Jobs."

"Government must lower taxes on booze or risk losing thousands of jobs to black-market smuggling, the president of the Association of Canadian Distillers warned yesterday."

It isn't complicated. What you promised in 1990 about taxing the corporations: Right now the fact of the matter is that taxation levels are too high. We've been overtaxing in this province, and the people of this province will do anything to avoid paying taxes.

He goes on to further say, "Cut the taxes and remove the incentives to smuggle, because if you do not, at the end of the day, you're going to get less and less revenue." You're going to have to run around and look at cutting more and more programs because, as this government found out, all of the things that we care about, whether it's the health care system, the education system, they don't depend upon the compassion of a government. They depend on having a healthy and prosperous economy to support them.

All your self-styled, self-serving sensitivity in the world isn't going to pay off until you learn one lesson. Government spending is still too high. Taxes are still too high, and that's why jobs are not being created in the province of Ontario.

To the members opposite, some who are here and some who are listening: If you take one thing away from this debate, when you try and tax insurance premiums and beer for the average hard-working people out there, it's wrong, and we're going to oppose the taxation levels.

You need to cut spending, because when it gets to taxation, you have to talk about specifically the spending cuts, and for those members who want the 10-point plan, for the last three reports, they're in there. They deal with welfare reform. They deal with WCB. They deal with the employer health tax. They deal with all the broad issues that we felt were important, and we laid them out for you.



I've also had the opportunity over the last little while to sit on our small business task force as the critic for Economic Development and Trade, and I want to tell you, the people who have created the jobs, the small businesses, the entrepreneurs are very discouraged.

One person summed it up. I guess we were in Belleville. The man owned a small menswear store. He said, "You know what the problem is right now? This is it in a nutshell. I have two children. One wants to be a nurse and one wants to be a teacher." Great professions, very respectable. We've got a lot of nurses and teachers. I think everybody is very respectful.

He said, "The reason they don't want to be entrepreneurs is they said, 'Dad, we see how hard you work, six days a week, sometimes seven days a week, never take a holiday and at the end of the day, you barely take anything home for your hard labour because of the taxation levels.'" Again, to this government, it isn't just provincial. "You don't take very much home. We don't want to be entrepreneurs. We want to get in the public sector and be teachers and nurses because being an entrepreneur today doesn't get you much because of our taxation levels."

The fact of the matter is the new generation coming up does not want to be entrepreneurs because, at the end of the day, if you make a buck in the province of Ontario, this government's going to just tax more of it out of you.

The only good news here is that this government's mandate is coming to a close. I don't think their last budget, which will be the one in May, will increase taxes. We'll continue to fight on it. The only good thing is, at end of the day, we're getting closer and closer to the end of this great socialist experiment in the province of Ontario. That will be the best thing for job creation. I can't wait for that election.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** The member's time has expired. Questions and/or comments?

**Mr Sutherland:** I just want to make a few things clear here at the beginning. First of all, the member for Oakville South has been talking about taxing beer and taxing insurance. Let's be very clear about what we did.

Yes, we increased taxes on you-brew, but let's remember, you-brew only makes up a very, very small portion of the brewing industry in the province of Ontario. So to say that the average person who wants to—first of all, making it sound like it's an essential item is a little bit extreme, and the you-brew beer is still far cheaper than the amount of tax on the other beer. He's making it sound like beer has never been taxed before in the province of Ontario, which is just absurd.

1730

I found it very interesting, though, that again he brings up what they've done on welfare. He brings up what they suggest to do on WCB. He didn't mention Hydro. Do you know that the unfunded liability for WCB in 1980 was only \$400 million? By 1985 it was over \$5 billion. That's the Tory record of so-called managing WCB.

What about Ontario Hydro? What about the huge debt that was brought on at Ontario Hydro during the Tories'

time? They talk about that they've managed things and then the solution to everything: Reduce taxes, you get lots of jobs.

In a modern economy, you've got to do more than that. You've got to have skilled, trained people. You've got to have Jobs Ontario Training. You've got to have the Ontario Training and Adjustment Board. You've got to be proactive. You can't just sit back and take a 17th-century, Adam Smith view that if we just sit back and do nothing, the economy's going to do very well.

While you're sitting back doing nothing, the countries that are spending money on people, the countries that are investing in training, in technology, in community economic development, they're the countries that are having the healthy economies, they're the countries that are creating the jobs. That's what we're doing. We're going after the good models, not some 17th-century view that's totally out of date.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel):** I'd like to congratulate the member for Oakville South on his words of wisdom with respect to this bill. I think we could talk about a number of things in summary as to the things he's talked about: the tax on insurance, the tax on health and drug and dental and dirt and brew-your-own and all of those sorts of things. But I think the message that he's giving out to the people in this place, in this government, and with respect to the people of the province of Ontario, is that we've had enough with respect to taxes. We can't stand it.

I don't think he's suggesting, in response of some of the members over here, that the people of Ontario are dishonest; not at all. The fact of the matter is that they've had enough with respect to taxes. They're doing whatever they can do to avoid these taxes, and the underground economy is the result. It's a well-known thing and it's being developed. And yes, to be fair, it's not the sole result of your government; it's a result of the federal government as well. I don't think that you can take the full blame, but you can take a lot of blame with respect to this.

This topic with respect to auto insurance is one of the things that we could spend a lot of time on, and if I have an opportunity, I'd like to spend some time on it, specifically with respect to the trucking industry, simply with respect to people in my riding and other ridings like mine that are out in the country, where a car is a necessity, where you need a car, and it's just an added expense.

The minister who is responsible for auto insurance is sitting here in the House today. Of course, we remember back when the Ontario motorist protection plan, OMPP, was created, and that was created as a result of the fear of auto insurance going up. We heard great opposition to that.

Now we've come along, and I know the minister could come forward and say, "Oh, it's because of OMPP." It's not because of OMPP. It's one of the matters that is involved with respect to this tax. You have a lot of nerve standing in your place and saying, because of your policies, there's no increase in tax, when your Treasurer has the gall to tax auto insurance. It's an absolute disgrace.

**Hon Richard Allen (Minister without Portfolio in Economic Development and Trade):** I just want to react to a few of the comments made by the member for Oakville South. The overarching thesis of his argument appeared to be that somehow the taxation levels, whether they're high or not, are the principal cause of the fact that we have a depressed economy.

It only takes a little bit of observation around the world to look at many different kinds of tax regimes that in fact are having similar problems with their economies. Therefore, one would have to conclude that there may not be so close a relationship in point of fact.

In reality, if you're looking at some of our principal competitors around the Great Lakes states, for example, the combined corporate tax rates in Ontario are less than the combined corporate tax rates in those particular jurisdictions.

If you look at a tax that has sometimes been complained of by people in that party, namely, the employer health tax, it's very interesting that, although there have been some comment about that and some criticism of that particular tax, if you take a comment by Mr Iacocca, the head of the Chrysler Corp, in fact our tax is very modest with respect to the costs of employers in the United States when it comes to the cost of putting a car on the market. In fact there's an \$800-per-car benefit that our particular approach to health care funding creates for our auto producers.

One can go through our approach to taxation. We basically have a taxation system we inherited from the Tories and from the Liberals, added with the GST thrown on top from the federal government. We have taken an approach that we're trying to move towards a fair tax regime, and if we have been marked by anything for the common people of Ontario, it's because we have taken 270,000 people at the lower income level off the taxation system. We've moved our taxation more on to the upper level, away from the bottom, so that the people at the bottom will spend it all on the goods and services that are produced by Ontario workers.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired. Further questions or comments?

**Mr Bisson:** I didn't think I'd get a chance, but I want to put on the record a couple of things.

First of all, the member talks about the level of taxation. I would say to the member that he's saying that Ontarians, like everybody else across North America and the free world, want their taxes to go down. Well, does he purport at the same time that you have to do an equal cut on services?

One of the problems we have is that the people in this province—and it's a good problem to have—have a really good system of benefits and a really good system of government when it comes to providing services to the people, such as health care, such as public education, such as day care, which people ask and want from their governments. Are you advocating that we should absolve ourselves from that responsibility and take the draconian, Mike Harris, right-wing view of things, à la Ralph Klein and Brian Mulroney, and try to move in the opposite

direction so that what we end up with is a shell of the systems we know now, so that when people are ill they don't have the right to go to a hospital unless they've got a cheque in their pocket or the cash to put up front? If that's what you stand for, I don't stand for that at all. It's reprehensible that you would try to put forward such a view.

You also talk about taxation, that the level of taxation and the things this government has done are scaring investment out of the province. I would like to talk about a little bit of private sector investment in my riding in northern Ontario of Cochrane South. The figures this year on private sector investment are anywhere between \$600 million and \$700 million: on the part of Placer Dome, \$300 million for a superpit; Potter Station, over \$100-million investment—Northland Power is in the final throes of putting in a new plant into that community, over \$100 million; Hemlo, up in Marathon, a brand-new gold mine, \$50 million; Malette wafer board, expansion of the OSB if approved, \$50 million; a new granite plant up in Iroquois Falls still being negotiated, probably \$2 to \$3 million; Royal Oak, a new mine it's working on at the open pit in Hallnor—and the list goes on.

They're not being scared out of Ontario. They're rushing into the province because we've created the atmosphere for investment in this province.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired. The member for Oakville South has two minutes to reply.

**Mr Carr:** All you've got to do is talk to the average person. How can you be so out of touch, I ask the member for Cochrane South? Prosperity abounds, according to that member. The fact is that you've lost more jobs than any other province in Canada, than any other jurisdiction in North America. The unemployment rate has doubled. You've done more to cut services in education, health care, all the things you cared about, than any other government. You've been an absolute disgrace.

To the member for Hamilton West, who did listen intently, I will be polite, because I appreciate the fact that he was very intently listening. What I'm saying very clearly is that it's all relative to other jurisdictions. Yes, other jurisdictions have had problems, but it's all relative: Ours has been worse because of the high taxation.

He may be right about corporate taxes. What the people of this province want is the bottom line. Whether it's the municipal government's fault or the federal government's fault or the provincial government's fault, or all of them combined, or whether it's the WCB cost, the bottom line is that our jurisdiction has higher taxes than anybody else. And you cannot increase taxes, because if you increase taxes you're actually going to get less revenue. That's the bottom line, I say to the members opposite. You can't increase taxes. We've hit the wall. If you do it, people will avoid it. You will get no more revenue.

At the end of the day, the people are going to judge this government on the record, and the record is you've lost more jobs than anybody else. One of the big reasons is the high taxation levels. You'd better learn that quickly, because you've got another budget coming up. Unless you have the political courage to stand up to your



Premier and your Minister of Finance now, they'll continue to go down the road that we've been telling you for three years has been wrong. We've been proven right. At the end of the day, the people of this province are going to put their report card on you. The good thing is, in less than a year, I won't have to stand across from you, because most of you are going to be gone.

1740

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Bradley:** Thank you for the opportunity, Madam Speaker, to address a few remarks to this bill and the general budgetary policy at the same time, because this does deal with a budget bill, interestingly enough, from last year's budget.

One of the reasons I think the Premier and Minister of Finance are able to say, copying the Premier of British Columbia, that there'll be no new taxes is simply because they've already levied several taxes over the last three years and the implementation of those taxes is bringing considerable revenue to the government. We expect that as we get near the provincial budget we'll have all kinds of talk about no new taxes and things of that nature.

In addition to this, of course, there have been increases that a lot of people call taxes, what we in this House refer to as non-tax revenue; that is, various charges put out there to the private sector and to individuals in our province. I think that has to be remembered.

This particular bill has some taxes that I think could be somewhat detrimental to the province. It's very difficult to handle budgetary policy in difficult economic times like these. One can sympathize with the government's desire to have more revenue, and the quibble will be over how best to derive that revenue: Is it best to tax something else or is it best to tax what is proposed in Bill 138? Is it best to trim expenditures so you don't have to have tax increases? Is it best to borrow? It's not an easy choice, any way you look at it. I happen to object to certain parts of this tax, although I recognize that from time to time governments, this government included, have had to levy taxes to derive some funds to operate government.

It's interesting that many of the people out there who don't want a decline in services also don't want an increase in taxes. I've listened to people on the far right, for instance, who talk about cutting back. It's interesting when you meet with people who have these views but have two hats.

I've sat with some groups who, when they're part of one group, say: "What the provincial government should be doing is avoiding any tax increases. It should be reducing the deficit, trimming expenditures even more, getting out a knife that is very sharp." They sit in one group to say that. Some of the same people, however, sit on the hospital board or sit on the board of the children's aid society in an area, or sit as a director of one of the groups in the community that wants more funds to address its needs.

I always have to ask, "Which hat are you wearing today?" and explain why it is difficult for those of us who are in elected office to make those choices, because

sometimes we hear arguments made both for services to be provided, which is going to incur expenditures, and they would also like to have it the other way, with the taxes reduced. It's somewhat like oppositions always do, no matter which party sits on this side of the House: We would like to see that magic.

But the taxes here are a problem. I mention, for instance, that in good economic times people don't like taxes either, but if you want to expand programs—many of the members who sit on the government side today and some who didn't sit there before but were activists in the communities asked previous governments, Tory and Liberal, if they would increase services. They were quite effective, I thought, and quite committed to seeing these services expanded, the new programs brought in, and seldom called for trimming of expenditures. To meet these needs, governments did put forward taxes.

Sometimes there are taxes withdrawn. I think everybody, at least probably the government and the official opposition, would agree, for instance, with the withdrawal of OHIP premiums. I remember when the Progressive Conservative government brought in OHIP premiums. I knew they needed funds to operate the system of health care in the province, but I always felt OHIP premiums were not equal for everyone. There were some people who were not covered. Those who were fortunate enough to have a strong labour union in their area that fought for these particular premiums to be paid had the premiums paid. Some people who didn't necessarily have the union fighting on their behalf but were fortunate enough somehow to have those premiums paid or partially paid were in a better position than those who didn't have the premiums paid. It was an extremely unfair tax.

I remember the huge uproar there was when former Progressive Conservative Treasurer Darcy McKeough proposed a 37.5% increase in those premiums. Those of us who sat in the opposition at that time thought that was, first of all, a very excessive tax increase, but second, I think we fought it even more because we recognized that premiums being paid for the purposes of health care did not balance out equally for people. They were often hardest on those who did not have the ability to pay. Even with a system that assisted with the payment of those premiums, there were still a lot of people who were left out in the cold. So those premiums were abolished.

Well, revenue had to be found to replace those premiums because they represented a lot of the cost of health care being provided for through the payment of those premiums. So other taxes were levied, including the employer health tax, which certainly isn't popular but was designed to replace the OHIP premiums to a certain extent.

I'm concerned in the present, fragile economy. We're still in a recession. I hope we're coming out of it. I see some good signs and some negative signs, but I think it's not wise right now to be increasing taxes, because it extracts money from the economy.

I don't believe that if you abolished all taxes somehow the economy would start booming and everything would be fine, but I just thought at the time of the last budget when this tax was levied that it would have a negative

impact on the economy rather than a positive impact on the economy.

I looked at the specific ones—I heard the member for Hamilton Mountain, who is the minister responsible for insurance premiums and insurance, talking about insurance premiums not going up. He has to be the only one in the province—he's fortunate; I must find out who his insurance company is—whose insurance premiums have in fact either stayed the same or declined. I know I went into the office to have mine lowered and I even upped the deductibility and so on, and I left the office with even more of a premium. So I think the tax on those premiums increases that cost, and for many people that's essential.

I'm concerned about the tax on the premiums for what we call group benefits. Again, I think the employees are going to end up paying that because employers, at this time, cannot afford to pay more in most instances and, as a result, they are trying to extract concessions from their employees. One of the reasons they would want to extract a concession is so that the cost of the tax on the premiums on group benefits could be looked after.

In addition to this, there was the issue of aggregate and soil and so on where the exemption was removed. So that increased the costs at a time when we want to get the economy spurred on.

The brew-your-own tax is the one that is a mystery to me most of all because I know that the New Democratic Party always portrayed itself as the party of the person who didn't have much money, and brew-your-own—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. I'd like to be able to hear the member speaking. Please resume.

**Mr Bradley:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for assisting me. Brew-your-own was what some people could do and save themselves some money, and perhaps they saw it as a hobby as well, and I'm surprised actually to see the government bring a tax in on that.

**Warranty repairs:** Again, I think my colleague has addressed that particular issue.

I think there are places where governments can save money. For instance, I look at the budget for polling. I've raised with the Premier on a number of occasions how much money is spent on polling. All governments have spent that money on polling, but I remember the New Democratic Party, in principle, was very much opposed to spending money. I saw some \$8 million over the last few years spent on polls to tell the government what it thinks, and I think that's one place where money could be saved.

I think on government advertising the money could be saved. I know I've had constituents, as you, Madam Speaker, may have had constituents do the same, who have contacted me, written to me, telephoned my constituency office to say they're highly annoyed—and I realize this is a government agency, not the government directly—with the Ontario Hydro ads that say, "This is the new Ontario Hydro."

All that is is a self-serving, self-congratulatory ad. If it's solid news, if it's solid recommendations to people on how they might save energy, good information, then I

think that's justified. But these ads that come on and say, "The new Ontario Hydro," I think even the president of the Power Workers' Union has objected to that.

So those are the kinds of things that could be done to save money, and even the government members agree with me, I see. I'm happy to see that.

1750

I'm worried about something else. I understand why governments tax. I'm worried about a couple of other things, and I won't go into my anti-gambling speech today. I will allow that for another day, although I intend to speak on that a number of other times because I really think it's a movement in the wrong direction. But because you're in the chair today—the Speaker in the chair is the member for Niagara Falls—I'm going to be charitable and not address that particular issue.

I want to deal with the tuition hike as well, and compare it with this, yet another, tax, ill-timed, excessive. I'm quite concerned because I remember—when I was young I thought this would be great—the New Democratic Party was going to abolish tuition. As a person coming out of high school, I thought: "This is wonderful. I won't have to pay very much in the way of tuition. In fact, it'll be declining, it'll be removed." What we've seen in the latest initiative is in fact a 20% increase.

I notice the editorialists are largely in favour of this. The university presidents naturally are in favour of it; it's more money for the universities. But the students find themselves in a more difficult situation. Let me say why. Again, if the economy were booming, a lot of those students could go out and get a job, often a good-paying job in industry, to help supplement the cost of education. But it's very difficult today; there aren't many jobs out there. I won't assign blame or get into that today, but there aren't many jobs out there and that's why I thought, as with this tax, the tuition increase of that magnitude was not justified. The opposition and students would complain if there were any increase, but I think the complaint becomes more legitimate when we look at the size of it.

I know that if the money were spent on what people considered to be appropriate, it would be much easier to accept taxes. I have a couple of letters today from people who are friends or spokespersons on behalf of residents of Linhaven nursing home in St Catharines. It's a senior citizens' home and a nursing home and it has a reputation over the years of providing top-notch service to the people in it. But because of cutbacks in that area, that service is now declining.

This is from Peter Monck, the president of Linhaven residents' council, who writes as follows—

**The Acting Speaker:** Excuse me. To the members, if there are conversations that are important, could you please hold them somewhere else. Thank you. I would like to hear the member. Please go ahead.

**Mr Bradley:** Mr Monck states the following in writing to the Minister of Health:

"As the president of the Linhaven residents' council, I am writing to you on behalf of the council to express my concerns about the social contract act and long-term



care funding cutbacks on the quality of life of residents of Linhaven.

"During the last provincial election campaign, it was often affirmed that the long-term care facilities would never be cut back in funding. Such reductions would contribute to a ghetto-like senior society similar to the sad situation that existed during the Great Depression.

"In the past, the province has always been a supportive partner with long-term care facilities management and has allowed for progress in caring for Ontario's elderly. Please don't let the strong anti-institutional bias of a few slash care to unacceptable levels for seniors who need it most. Please fulfil the promise made with long-term care reform of better care in facilities and easier access to that care when it is needed.

"We will watch future developments with great interest and will assess your government's performance with respect to this issue. This issue is one of great importance to those of us who may speak for the interests of those seniors who are dependent upon services provided by Linhaven Home for the Aged."

It's signed by Peter Monck, president of the Linhaven residents' council, and I've received from parents of people in there, from spouses of people in there, from relatives and the families, the daughters and sons of people in there, other letters.

If the money from this tax were applied to this service, and it's obviously not being applied, these people might be prepared to sustain this tax. It's similar to the situation we confront with safety in our streets. I happen to think there are a lot of people out there who, while they are averse to increases in taxes, if they could see that community safety was increased as a result, might be prepared to accept those kinds of taxes.

We've had some suggestions over the past couple of weeks in the House that I think have been positive. We've had suggestions from the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force that people turn in their guns in exchange for some kind of vouchers. That suggestion on the part of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force is a good one and it was raised by one of the party leaders here at the same time.

There was a suggestion yesterday by the deputy leader of the Liberal Party that there be a restriction on the ability to purchase ammunition, and I think there was a lot of consensus in this House that it was reasonable, that somebody shouldn't simply be able to walk in off the street and make those purchases.

I think there was a general nodding of heads in this House when it was stated that there shouldn't be plea bargaining where people can bargain away a sentence that is for the use of a firearm or a firearm violation while at the same time they are convicted of something else—pretty good consensus there.

In terms of police budgets, though I don't believe the only solution is to add more and more police, I think in communities there are initiatives where there's community policing, where there's a visibility out there that can be very helpful.

The cutbacks have had an effect on policing and have

had an effect, to a certain extent, on those people who might be contemplating committing a crime. That's why I believe that people in our province, if they could be reasonably assured this would act as a deterrent, would be prepared to accept a tax of this kind.

I also believe that people want in the longer term to address the social conditions which exist, which end up in crime. Those social conditions are never an excuse for committing crimes and never should be an excuse, but they're always there to be noted and there to be addressed so that again we reduce the chances of crime being committed.

People out there are looking, in my view, for value-for-dollar. Sometimes they get it. Some of the programs the government proposes are good and they're good value for the dollar that is spent. If you can sell that to the people, and I say that in the best sense, people will accept that.

This is where I divert back a bit to gambling and this is why, if the government were to put forward programs and then put forward taxes and those programs were accepted by the people, I think you would find less opposition to taxes even in difficult times. This is why I see a trend across this country of governments wanting to go to gambling. It's difficult to get a bill such as this past the House. The opposition objects, the third party objects, the people object, and even within the government caucus there are objections to tax increases.

So the easy out is to set up casinos, to expand offtrack betting, and the next thing I predict is that you're going to see the video terminals. That debate is before the cabinet at this time, because they need that revenue.

What I am saying with a tax like this is, the reason you see as much opposition to this is because a sufficient number of people object to specific programs the government has out there that they believe do not represent a good expenditure of dollars. Where you have good programs and where you can tie a bill such as this to the provision of those services, I think you make it much more acceptable for people out there to sustain this kind of revenue-raising.

I have an opportunity to go on at some more length, but we are getting close to 6 of the clock, as we say in this House. I simply want to say that in the new budget, my expectation is that since we have all kinds of taxes already levied with revenues coming in, and greater revenues I'm sure when indeed the economy improves, that we can expect there will be no increase in taxes. The member for Kitchener-Wilmot, who sits behind me, nods acquiescently, if not in quick agreement, with what I'm saying.

I urge the government, then, to look at other places where they can trim expenditures. They've tried some of this, and I want to say to the Chair of Management Board, there have been some cuts made, and they're not easy. It's now treasury board that has that responsibility, but the Chair of Management Board had that at the beginning; that position had that. It's not easy to do, because I know, for instance, on local councils, senior levels of government—

**The Acting Speaker:** I'd like to ask the member to break off his remarks.

**Mr Bradley:** As I get near the very end of my remarks with about 30 seconds to go, I notice that many of our friends on municipal councils, who are often the most vociferous in wanting to cut taxes and trim expenditures, are also the most vocal when it comes to suggesting that the provincial or federal government should spend more money, and I think that's rather revealing in itself.

I hope to have an opportunity to conclude my remarks at the next session of this Legislature and thank members for their rapt and kind attention.

**The Acting Speaker:** We thank the member for St Catharines. He will have a chance to resume the debate on Bill 138 at a future date.

At this time, I will ask the government House leader for his report.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon Brian A. Charlton (Government House Leader):** Pursuant to standing order 55, I wish to

indicate the business of the House for the coming week.

On Monday, April 18, we will continue second reading of Bill 138, the Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act. Following that, we will begin second reading of Bill 110, the employer health tax act.

On Tuesday, April 19, and Wednesday, April 20, we will give second reading consideration to Bill 146, the Corporations Tax Amendment Act.

On the morning of Thursday, April 21, during private members' public business, we will consider ballot item number 49, a resolution concerning shelter allowance standing in the name of Mr Bisson, and ballot item number 50, standing in the name of Mr Chiarelli, the subject matter of which is to be determined and will be tabled on the next day this House meets. On Thursday afternoon, we will begin second reading consideration of Bill 136, the courts of justice act.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms Margaret H. Harrington):** It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday, April 18.

The House adjourned at 1803.



# CONTENTS

Thursday 14 April 1994

## PRIVATE MEMBERS'

### PUBLIC BUSINESS

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Blood-Alcohol), 1993, Bill 93,</b>                      |            |
| <i>Mr Offer</i> , second reading  |            |
| Mr Offer  | 5601, 5608 |
| Mr Turnbull   | 5602       |
| Mr Dadamo   | 5602       |
| Ms Poole  | 5603       |
| Mr McLean   | 5605       |
| Mr Mills  | 5606       |
| Mr Cooper   | 5607       |
| Agreed to   | 5617       |
| <b>Junior kindergarten, private member's notice of motion number 36, <i>Mr Arnott</i></b> |            |
| Mr Arnott   | 5608, 5617 |
| Mr Fletcher   | 5610       |
| Mr Beer   | 5611       |
| Mrs Cunningham  | 5613       |
| Mrs Haslam  | 5614       |
| Mr Hodgson  | 5614       |
| Mr Malkowski  | 5615       |
| Mr Jackson  | 5616       |
| Agreed to   | 5617       |

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

|                                     |      |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| <b>Paul Watson</b>                  |      |
| Mr Offer                            | 5618 |
| <b>Closing of campgrounds</b>       |      |
| Mr Villeneuve                       | 5618 |
| <b>Assistance to native farmers</b> |      |
| Mrs Mathysen                        | 5618 |
| <b>Race relations</b>               |      |
| Mr Murphy                           | 5618 |
| <b>Property assessment</b>          |      |
| Mr Turnbull                         | 5619 |
| <b>Citizen of the Year</b>          |      |
| Mr Abel                             | 5619 |
| <b>Water extraction agreements</b>  |      |
| Mr Elston                           | 5619 |
| <b>Victims of crime</b>             |      |
| Mr Jackson                          | 5619 |
| Ms Harrington                       | 5620 |

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

|                              |      |
|------------------------------|------|
| <b>Workers' compensation</b> |      |
| Mr Rae                       | 5620 |
| Mr Mahoney                   | 5621 |
| Mrs Witmer                   | 5621 |

## ORAL QUESTIONS

|                            |      |
|----------------------------|------|
| <b>Public safety</b>       |      |
| Mrs McLeod                 | 5624 |
| Mr Christopherson          | 5624 |
| <b>Dangerous offenders</b> |      |
| Mrs McLeod                 | 5626 |
| Mrs Boyd                   | 5626 |

## Workers' Compensation Board

|            |            |
|------------|------------|
| Mr Harris  | 5627       |
| Mr Rae     | 5627, 5630 |
| Mr Mahoney | 5630       |

## Jobs Ontario

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Harris | 5629 |
| Mrs Boyd  | 5629 |

## Homes for the aged

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Harnick | 5631 |
| Mr Rae     | 5631 |

## Planning approval

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Jamison | 5632 |
| Mr Philip  | 5632 |

## Child care

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Beer   | 5632 |
| Mr Silipo | 5632 |

## Highway construction

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Turnbull | 5633 |
| Mr Pouliot  | 5633 |

## MOTIONS

### Private members' public business

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Charlton | 5633 |
| Agreed to   | 5633 |

## PETITIONS

### Violence

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Ms Poole   | 5633 |
| Mr Bradley | 5636 |

### Sexual orientation

|               |            |
|---------------|------------|
| Mr Jim Wilson | 5634, 5635 |
| Mr Arnott     | 5634       |
| Mr Curling    | 5635       |

### Firearms safety

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Mr Wood       | 5634 |
| Mr Hope       | 5634 |
| Mr Brown      | 5635 |
| Mr Jim Wilson | 5636 |

### Tuition fees

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Mr Murphy | 5634 |
|-----------|------|

### Land-lease communities

|              |      |
|--------------|------|
| Mrs Mathysen | 5635 |
|--------------|------|

### Haemodialysis

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Mr Jim Wilson | 5635 |
|---------------|------|

### Transportation for the disabled

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr O'Connor | 5635 |
|-------------|------|

### Highway safety

|         |      |
|---------|------|
| Mr Wood | 5636 |
|---------|------|

### Camping

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| Mr Brown | 5636 |
|----------|------|

## FIRST READINGS

### Ammunition Control Act, 1994,

|                            |      |
|----------------------------|------|
| Bill 149, <i>Mr Murphy</i> |      |
| Mr Murphy                  | 5636 |
| Agreed to                  | 5636 |

### Registration of Pedophiles Act, 1994,

|                              |      |
|------------------------------|------|
| Bill 150, <i>Mr Turnbull</i> |      |
| Mr Turnbull                  | 5636 |
| Agreed to                    | 5636 |

## SECOND READINGS

### Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, 1993, Bill 138, *Mr Laughren*

|                  |                        |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Mr Stockwell     | 5637, 5641             |
| Mr Bisson        | 5640, 5653             |
| Mr Carr          | 5640, 5646, 5647, 5653 |
| Mr Mammoliti     | 5640                   |
| Mr Bradley       | 5641, 5646, 5654       |
| Mr Curling       | 5642, 5647             |
| Mr Hope          | 5646                   |
| Mr Farnan        | 5647                   |
| Mr Sutherland    | 5652                   |
| Mr Tilson        | 5652                   |
| Mr Allen         | 5653                   |
| Deemed adjourned | 5657                   |

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Referral of question

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| The Speaker | 5622 |
|-------------|------|

### Visitors

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| The Speaker | 5622 |
|-------------|------|

### Israeli independence commemoration

|            |      |
|------------|------|
| Mr Rae     | 5622 |
| Mrs McLeod | 5623 |
| Mr Harris  | 5624 |

### Business of the House

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| Mr Charlton | 5657 |
|-------------|------|

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 14 avril 1994

## AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1993 modifiant le Code de la route (présence d'alcool dans le sang), projet de loi 93,</b> |      |
| <i>M. Offer</i> , deuxième lecture   | 5601 |
| Adoptée  | 5617 |

## PREMIÈRE LECTURE

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Loi de 1994 sur la réglementation des munitions, projet de loi 149,</b> |      |
| <i>M. Murphy</i>   | 5636 |
| Adoptée  | 5617 |
| <b>Loi de 1994 sur l'inscription des pédophiles, projet de loi 150,</b>    |      |
| <i>M. Turnbull</i>   | 5636 |
| Adoptée  | 5617 |

## DEUXIÈME LECTURE

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Loi de 1993 modifiant la Loi sur la taxe de vente au détail, projet de loi 138, <i>M. Laughren</i></b> | 5637 |
| Débat ajourné   | 5657 |

432100062







JUL 6 1994



